
T H E
C A S E
O F T H E
Afflicted Clergy.

I Now proceed to examine another of the Pamphlets, by which these of the Episcopal Clergy, who hate, and malign the Presbyterians, do load them with reproaches, and aggravate their own sufferings, beyond all the bounds of Modesty and Truth: Its Title is, *The Case of the present afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly represented.* Thus we are Treated by Men of a restless Temper, who are embittered in their Spirits, by what inconveniency they are fallen into, from the Ease, and Dominion over their Brethren, that they lately had. One Book after another we are Lashed with: If they would speak Truth, and exercise Reason, rather than express Rage and Fury, we would bear it; and clear our selves in the Consciences of all impartial Men. But we must be content to take things as they are, and defend the truth, and our selves, from these assaults that they think fit to make, of whatever sort they be. Before I come to the Book it self, I shall a little consider the Preface. He commendeth the Moderation, and Integrity of the Author, and indeed it was needful: For none living could gather either of these two good qualities from this Pamphlet. He telleth us of the design of that Book, *To procure pity from the most Charitable Church of England*; a begging design as I marked on the other Pamphlet. *That Men may consider the Fatal Consequences of Papal Supremacy in a Protestant Kirk.* If he would have his words understood, or believed,

B

lieved, he should shew us wherein such a Supremacy is exercised; But railing doth best in general Terms. It is also, *That the Church of England should betink themselves how to quench the Flames, lest it destroy themselves.* Thus they sow Discord among Brethren, and animate *England* to concern themselves in the Affairs of our Church, when we do not meddle in their matters. He will have all *Scotts Presbyterians* to be Persecutors, and chargeth them with *thinking that they do God good service when they kill Bishops.* Which Facts, that he aimeth at, the Generality of Presbyterians did abhor, as much as he can do. This is an early test of the Moderation and Integrity that we are to expect from this piece. He further proveth our Persecution, by citing some passages out of *B. Burnet*. Whom being a party, we are not to admit as a witness against us. Yet we acknowledge in his Citations, the truth of some rigour that was used in these times of Broils and Contentions; which Presbyterians do not Generally allow. If we would recriminate, we could lessen these excesses almost to nothing, by narrating the Barbarity used in *Scotland* by his party against us: But I rather wish that both may study Sobriety and Moderation, than defend, or practise over again what hath been amiss. I commend what followeth: His attempting to narrow the differences that are between Presbyterians and Episcopal Men in *Scotland*. In Doctrine we are professedly one, but really there is a party among them who differ from us, especially about the *Arminian points*: In Worship, the difference is very small: Only (contrary to his design) he wideneth it, when he falsly saith, that some in time of Prayer uncover their heads but by halves. Was ever this approved by Presbyterians? What he imputeth to us of fulsome Expressions, and vain Repetitions, is a Calumny; if there be some on our side, there are more on his, who through ignorance, or unseriousness may be charged with this. It is also false, that at Baptism, we bind the parties to the solemn League and Covenant: May be some might do it in a time when we had no Government, but it is thought fit among us to make the Word of God the standard of what we believe, and bind our selves to practise.

§ 2. He essayeth to make a parallel also betwixt our and their Discipline; but in that he is not so happy. For tho' we deny not that they have something that looketh like Parochial Discipline: And also the name of Presbyteries; yet they have but a shadow of both: For not only all that power that any of their pretended Judicatories exercise is derived from the Bishop: But the exercise of it de-

dependeth on him, and he can supersede it when he pleaseth: Which if any of them should deny, I can prove by two Instances in one Presbytery: *Viz.* That of *Chirnside*. One for habitual Drunkenness on the Sabbath day, being cited before the Session, and for disobedience to them being cited before the Presbytery, while they were managing the process, a prohibition was procured from the Bishop of *Edinburgh*, which stopt the process, and the Man Drank on, in defiance of both Presbytery and Session. Another accused for living with a Woman as his Wife, to whom he was never Married, and being processed by the same steps as the former; by a prohibition from the same Bishop the Presbytery desisted; and the parties continued in their former course of Life: And yet this Prefacer hath the Forehead to say, that their Discipline is the same with that of *Geneva*; and I believe his party will give him little thanks for the condescensions he hath here made, as we dislike them, because not true, nor ingenuous. But we know the design of such pretended moderation; it is to load the Presbyterians with the guilt of causeless Schism, as appeareth in the sequel of his Discourse: But when they debate with us about the difference betwixt a Presbyter and Bishop, they speak in another strain. It is also false, that *they have Elders who are no Ministers*, these among them who are more ingenuous will not allow them that name; much less do they give them the Power of Ruling Elders, or own in them the same Authoritative, and decisive Power as the Ministers have: I know no other design in keeping up Sessions, and Presbyteries in *Scotland*, but that the people, who have since the Reformation been used to Presbyterian Government, and can comply willingly to no other Church way, may be deceived with the shadow of it, when the thing is cunningly taken away. He saith *that in Synods all things are carried by plurality of Votes*. It is so indeed when the Bishop pleaseth; but dare they Vote any thing, or can any thing be carried by their Authority, without his Lordships consent? I think none of them will affirm this. He confesseth the Bishop hath the power of Ordination in him; tho' he useth to take the consent of the Brethren of the Presbytery along with him (that this is always to be done he affirmeth; but I am sure it is not the Principle of Episcopal Men :) All this considered, let any judge, whether he speaketh truth when he saith, that the Bishop is but a constant Moderator. A Moderator hath no Power more than the least of the Meeting hath; only he ordereth the meeting, that all may not speak at once: proposeth Matters to them, pronounceth, as their

Month, what is the Mind of the Meeting: But nothing is determined by his Authority; nor are the Judicatories of the Church his Council, as Episcopal Assemblies are to the Bishop. We do then maintain, that there is such a difference between them and us, as may justify our not owning of the Bishops Authority, nor the Authority of the Meetings that is derived from it, and dependeth on it. We never used such an Argument to justify Rebellions: It was not the exercising Episcopal power that caused what he so calleth; but their forcing the Consciences of Men, and Barbarous Persecutions, whereby people were put to the utmost extremities. If the Consciences of his party could plead not guilty, of the Murders and Butcheries that have happened, as well as the Sober Presbyterians can, who had no interest in them, but to Lament them, and the occasions of them, it were well for them. If Barbarities be committed now against them, we defend them not, nor are they chargeable on the Presbyterians; but on some few whom their Persecution hath enraged. He telleth us of more Histories of the Clergies Sufferings to come out. Our Work is to Examine these that now he is pleased to offer. If he prove by his Collection of passages, all that in his Preface he proposeth to make out by them, we shall succumb in the Debate: But I am sure some of them cannot be proved, other things cannot infer the Consequents that he draweth from them: But I will not anticipate. What remains of his Preface is a renewing of his begging Address to the *Church of England*: What they get that way we do not envy: We wish indeed the Change of Episcopacy (though we will take no unwarrantable course to effect even that) but not the Ruine of Episcopal Men.

§ 3. The Book it self is odly methodized. We have two leaves called the first Collection of Papers. Next a Letter, under the Title of the whole Book: Then the first Collection of Papers begun again: And so to the second, third, and fourth Collections: But we must follow whither he thinketh fit to lead. I must here refer the Reader to what I have said in Answer to the first Book, and the second Letter. Sect. 6. Where it is made appear that the Presbyterians are not accountable for the disorders that are said to have been acted; Tho all the Stories that are told were true. But because in this Pamphlet we have Attestations added to the Narratives that are brought, which is not done in the other, somewhat must be observed concerning that. Which is, that mostly they are *teste meipso*, the Complainant is the witness, which is not fair.
And

And often one of these Ministers witnesses for another, and he doth him the like kindness, for requital: Which derogateth much from the Credibility of such Testimonies. Further, all of his Witnesses are the sworn Enemies of Presbyterians, and in a Combination to defame them: And we have from the Pamphlets now under consideration a taste of the veracity of the Men whom we have to do with. If his Witnesses make no more Conscience of speaking truth, than the Author, or Authors of these Pamphlets do; few thinking Men will be moved with what they say. I come now to consider his particular Stories. He beginneth with the Minister of *Cummock*, with whom he joineth the Minister of *Auchinleck*: Whom ninety Armed Men forced into the Church-yard, discharged them to Preach, and tore their Gowns: And declared, that this they did, not as Statesmen, nor as Churchmen; but by Violence, and in a Military way of Reformation. *Ans.* It is Attested under the hands of George Logan of Logan, William Crawford of Dalegles, John Campbell of Horfeclough, George Campbell of Glaisnock, John Beg of Dornal, John Mitchel of Wherstonburn; all of the two Parishes mentioned: That they who did this were not of either of these Parishes, nor was it known who they were: Only that they were *Cameronians*, who had suffered severely; and were now gathered together on occasion of an Alarm that then was in the Countrey: Nor had any in these Parishes any Accession to that practice. And it is to be observed, that many of these Ministers entred by a Military Force, as they were so put out: particularly the Minister of *Auchinleck* had his Edict served with three Troops of Dragoons: And that People never submitted to these Mens Ministry, but by the force that was put on them by Armed Men: And they suffered very hard things; and yet the people of these Parishes bore it patiently. In the business of *Machlin* he grossly belyeth them: They used no violence to the Ministers Wife; only gravely reprov'd her for Cursing and Swearing, which she used. He passeth page 4. to the Presbytery of *Dumbarton*, where first he telleth us, What Mr. Walter Stirling, Minister at *Badernock*, met with by a Company of Dissenters. This is a gross Lie: These five Armed Men who assaulted his House (having done the like to a Gentlemans House, and a Countreymans House, the same Night, seeking Arms, or Plunder) were no Dissenters, of any sort or way, but Debauched Men, horrid Swearers, and Cursers, who were of broken desperate Fortunes; their Names are John Momillan, Patrick Morarged, George Tomoch, Archibald Ferguson, Archibald Shinning. This one passage, duely

confi-

considered, might discredit all that is asserted in his Book, and expose the Author as a malicious Calumniator, designing to fix all the Thefts, Robberies, and other Villanies, that are committed in the Country, not only on some Presbyterian or other; but on the whole party. It is also witnessed that Mr. *Stirling's* Parish gave him all the help and succour they could in this his trouble. This Mr. *Stirling* was afterwards deprived by the State, for not Reading nor Praying, after which time he behoved to remove from the Church, and Dwelling-house, but to this day liveth peaceably in the Parish. Yea Mr. *Stirling* himself disowned that account of his Case which is in the Pamphlet, as what he had no hand in. For the two following Mr. *Duncan* of *Kilpatrick Easter*, and the Minister that was to preach at *Boiall*: In the Narration of what concerneth *Kilpatrick Easter*, there is a gross Lie: None touched Mr. *Duncan*, nor did any personal hurt to him: Which is affirmed by them who know that Matter: And may be confirmed by considering, that that parties Zeal led them no farther than to rid themselves of these Ministers who had been such a burden to them. For that Man who was to preach at *Boiall*; the Truth of the Story is, A great many came with a Burial to the Church-yard; among them, not above six or seven had Arms, who did always bear Arms: None of them made any Opposition: Only they sent to the Minister of the Parish to desire him to give them the Keys of the Church; seeing he himself could not Preach; He promised to do it, if the Heritors should demand them; which several of them did; and offered to suffer him to stay in the house forty days, if he would give up the Keys: He contrary to his promise, refused to give them up; but went away that day, and carried away his Furniture, except some Lumber which the People after took out of the House, in presence of his Brother, and Man-servant; without doing the least hurt to them.

§ 4. Let us now consider the Letter, which beginneth pag. 1. excluding what hath gone before. He beginneth with taking notice, that *Episcopacy* was abolished by the Parliament, on account of its being contrary to the inclinations of the People, and so may be restored by another Parliament. But he should have considered, that whatever motive the Estates went on, it is declared against in the *Claim of Right*, as a Grievance; and therefore cannot be restored without overturning the Foundation of our present Civil Settlement. That *Presbytery* was never Settled by Law, except in times of trouble and danger to the State, by the practices of that Party; I have sufficiently refuted in my

my former *Vindication on Quest. 2. P. 11.* He taketh notice of a three fold turning out of Ministers, *By the Rabble, by the Convention of Estates, and by the Council*; For the first, he truly saith that it was no wonder, being in the Interval of Government (if he had added that it was done by a People rendred mad, by the Oppressions of these Men who suffered from them, he had done well) but he *thinketh strange that it was not redressed, when the Government was Settled*: This is answered in answer to Account of Persecutions, &c. Next, he giveth us an account of *the disaffection of the Western Shires to Episcopacy, of their compliance when Persecution grew hot*: Which we deny to have been so universal as he would have it: Tho' I deny not that many put some force on their Light: Also, their compliances so far as to hear these men, when they could hear none else, is no Obligation on them to cleave to them as their Ministers: Especially when opportunity was put in their Hands to hear others. Wherefore it is no Imputation, nor blame, that when a Liberty was given for Meeting-houses, they made use of that opportunity. Neither are their Addresses to be blamed, wherein they acknowledge the goodness of God, and thank men, for that Liberty, which, tho' their due, had been detained from them. Tho' his *Wife men told them that the Liberty was granted to bring in Popery*; Yet as Wise men as they, thought, that the best way to keep it out was to make use of the Liberty, for setting people in the right way; and to beware of countenancing, approving of, or concurring in, any thing that might promote Popery: Such as, owning the *Dispensing Power* (which he most injuriously imputeth to them) and concurring for taking away the *Penal Laws against Popery*, But of these things I have sufficiently discoursed in my former *Vindication*; as also of what followeth, that there were few Meeting Houses at first: But that *this is a kind of Demonstration of the Inclinations of the People toward Episcopacy*. I see not; nor understand what kind of Demonstration it is, unles it be a Paralogyfin: Next he giveth account of *Two sorts of Presbyterians, viz. Hill men (as he calleth them) and others*: And doth untruly, and not without Malice against the Sober Presbyterians, assert, that the former acted more consequentially to Presbyterian principles: The contrary of which is evident in this, (as in many more things, that might be mentioned) that two or three Preachers separated from all the rest of the Church, and refused subjection to their Meetings.

§ 5. In what followeth this Author dealeth more ingenuously than the former that I dealt with: For he imputed the Rabbling work to the Presbyterians in General; this Man layeth it only on the

the *Camerunians*; but even them he foully mis-representeth; while he speaketh of their *Eating and drinking plentifully at the expence of them whom they Rabled*: All the Reports that we have of them, give account of their *not Laying their hands on the Prey*, as it is said of the Jews after *Haman's Persecution*, *Esth. 9. 15, 16*. But what is here asserted falsely in general, we shall have after more particularly: Where it shall be Examined. In his Historical account of things that followeth, page, 6th I have nothing to observe, but that he prevaricateth in alledging the *Prince of Orange's Declaration*, Feb. 6. 1689. Which only saith that every one shall enjoy the Opinion and forms of worship, with the same freedom, and in the same manner as they enjoyed it in *October last*: But saith nothing of restoring any thing which they lost, as he alledgeth, but leaveth that to be done by regular and legal Methods. That which followeth, is an account of the tumult at *Glasgow*, upon the *Episcopal Ministers Resuming the Pulpit*, after the *Princes Declaration*, that none should disturb one another in matters of Religion: This is more fully set down in his 2d Collection of Papers, P. 50. viz. That the *Magistrates and Ministers Assembled*, and resolved, that the *Ministers should Preach*, Feb. 17. as was usual: In order to this, they, by the chief Magistrate then in Town, required the *Captain of the Guard* to lay down Arms, as the declaration enjoined; He refused: After this, the People that used to meet in the Hills, and they of the *Meeting-houses*, whispered together about their *Bloody Designs against the Minister and his People*, On the Sunday they hindered the ringing of some of the Bells: They publicly threatned the People as they went to Church; they pursued a Minister, who escaped, by going into a House: The Magistrates going to Church found it Surrounded by a Rabble, whom they desired to go home in peace; but they Railed at the Magistrates, and assaulted them with Staves and Battons; gave a blow to John Bell one of the late Baillies; the Magistrates ordered the Towns Servants and Officers to beat off the Rabble, and so went into the Church; in time of Sermon the pretended Captain of the Guard came into the Church, crying aloud that the Town was in Arms: Toward the end the Rabble, conducted by the Laird of *Carlsland*, fired into it: A Boy was wounded in the Face; they brake open the Doors searched for the Parson and found him. They refuse to go home when the Magistrates required them: They took the People out of Church by fours and fives, and exposed them to the fury of the Rabble: Many were Wounded, and Rudely treated: and not a few Persons of some note, This Narrative (which I have abridged but not altered) is signed by *James Gibson Baillie, John Gilhagie, Patrick Bell*. For answer to all this;

this ; it is in the 1st. place to be considered, that little Faith is to be given to his Assertions ; and that on two accounts ; one is, the lying Stories that he had told of the People of *Glasgow*, Page 39. 40. As, that on *Thursday January 17. 1689.* The Minister did not enter into the Church. Also what is said about Mr. *Alexander George* is false. They did no more but search for the Keys of the Church Door and tore his Gown : Which we do not approve. They had been provoked by his Railing in a Sermon against our Reformers *Luther, Calvin, Knox, &c.* Not only so, but abundance of Lies are inter-spersed in the narrative of the tumult at the high Church, *Feb. 17.* As that a pernicious Rout surrounded the Church : It was only a few Women stood in the Church Door. That the Magistrates went to the Church with the Minister is false : For only Baily Gibson was there : That these Women or any else assaulted the Minister, or People, is false ; for his party were the first Aggressors : It is also false that 600 of the best quality in Town entered the Church without Arms : For there were not in all above 200 ; and not 40 of such quality ; and they (or many of them) were armed with Pistols, Swords, Clubs with Nails in the ends of them, &c. It is false, that the Ministers party suffered such things as he saith. For most, and they of the best quality, who were there, do acknowledge that no such thing was done to them, but that the Presbyterians conveyed them home in safety. Likewise what is said of their respect to the Prince of *Orange's* Declaration, is a lying pretence ; for it is well known, they have never shewed any respect to him, nor to his Government, but the contrary is apparent in their whole Conduct. It is also to be considered that the Witnesses brought to attest the Story, are not competent : *James Gibson* was a party, and made a Baily by the Archbishop, and all knew the Prelates Inclinations towards the present Civil Government. *John Gilhagie* is lookt on by all as a Foolish and Rash Man, who little considereth what he doth : *Patrick Bell*, and his Brother, were, soon after, seized for Treasonable practices ; were long in Prison, and are now under Bail. The truth in opposition to his lying Story is this : The Episcopal Ministers in the Town being thrust from their Churches by the Rabble, before the Government was settled, the Provost, *Walter Gibson*, (who had been chosen by the Archbishop) made a paction with the Presbyterians, (for preventing Confusion) That the Keys of all the Churches should be deposited in the hands of two Men till the Convention of Estates should determine in the matter ; instead of this, he being absent (may be

of purpose) his Brother, *Baily Gibson*, hired a Company of *Ruffians*, armed as is above exprest ; who with one Minister (a simple Man, whom they prevailed with) went to the Church, and found forty Women in the Door, fell on them and sadly wounded thirty two of them in a most Barbarous manner. The noise of this raised some of the Hill-men, who were in Town, who beat Drums, and got to Arms ; this occasioned the scattering of the Meeting-houses (who were quietly hearing the Word) some of the Sober Presbyterians dealt with the Hill-men, and endeavoured an Accommodation : Only some of the Friends of the Women who had been Wounded, could not be restrained from Violence : But what they did was nothing like what the Women had suffered : The Actors in this Tragedy who beat and wounded the Women, were *James Gibson Bailey*, *John Bell*, *Commislar Robertson*, *George Robertson*, and his two Sons, *John Robertson*, *John Wat*, *Inglis*, *Patrick Bell*, *James Marshal*, *John Coats*, *John Filshill*, *John Paterson*, *Horn*, *John Aitkin*, *Alexander Aitkin*, *James Lie's* two Sons, *James Robertson*. The Names of the Women who were Wounded, and many of them hardly cured, are, *Mrs. Maxwell*, *Mary Fleckfield*, *Marion Ewin*, *Agnes Rodger*, *Agnes Allan*, *Elizabeth Linning*, *Janet Londown*, *Margaret Dalglieish*, *Bessie Jackson*, *Janet Castellaw*, *Janet Fleeming*, *Janet Robertson*, *Margaret Inglis*, *Marion Finlaw*, *Janet Kid*, *Janet Brand*, *Christian Lang*, *Janet Wood*, *Mrs. Mill*, *Janet Howie*, *Margaret Lin*, *Catherine Lin*, *Isabel Paterson*, *Janet Young*, *Margaret Anderson*, *Margaret Corse*, *Bessie Fleeming*, *Griffel Brown*, *Bessie Marshal*, *Janet Shearer*, *Margaret Steven* : Some of them are not recovered to this day, now after two years : They all have suffered patiently, and wait for a hearing of their Cause, by a competent Judge, as was promised them all, this was sufficiently attested before *John Leckie* then Bailie.

§ 6. In p. 7. and 8, Of the Narrative, he telleth us, that instead of calling these Hill-men to an account for their disorders, these very men coming Armed to Edinburgh, had the thanks of the House given them for their good service, and are still a part of the standing Forces of that Kingdom : This he insisteth farther upon in the fourth Collection of passages. page 90, 91. where he setteth down the Act of the Convention. Where he also asserts that they Acted contrary to the Laws of Religion, Humanity, and of Nations, the Laws of this Kingdom, and the Princes Declaration, in driving out the Clergy being in number about 800 Overawed and Threatned the Electors of Members for the Convention, rushed in a tumultuary and hostile manner into Edin-

Edinburgh, &c. And this before they were under the Earl of Leven's Command; hence he is bold to condemn the Acts of the Estates approving of them. Here I observe a few things (referring the Reader to the Answer to Account of Persecution, &c. Letter 1. §8.) 1. it cannot be made appear, That that Body of Men Acted what he imputeth to the Rabble, yea it is evidently false, for he saith they were 8000, and in military order: The Rabble were scattered Companies, sometimes not above ten or twelve, or forty, or an hundred, and that under no fixed command; if there were some among them who came to *Edinburgh* who also were the Rabble, 'tis not to be wondered at, for it is often so in Armies that are in hostile opposition one to another. 2. That they were in Arms against Law, is false: For they were called by the Authority of the States, as their Guard, when their Enemies had gathered a Formidable party into *Edinburgh*. 3. That they hindered the Election of Members, for the Convention, is also false. Himself and Complices, in their accounts of these Elections, assign causes of such Members being chosen, inconsistent with this Force; viz. The negligence of their party. But *Oportet mendacem esse bene memorem*. 4. Tho' they were together before the Earl of Leven got the Command, yet not before they were called together by the Estates. 5. That they affronted either the Bishops, or the Nobility, is more than can be made out: Or that I have heard from any good hand. 6. That these Men are part of the standing Forces of the Kingdom (tho' there were no absurdity if it were so) is false. They were totally disbanded, a Regiment was indeed raised in that Countrey, a long time after: And new Officers were set over them: And if any of the same Men were listed Souldiers, it was accidental: But it is well known, that that Regiment hath done more Service to the King and Countrey, than others have done. What followeth page 18. deserveth but a little Animadversion; he saith *the Clergy suffered patiently without publick complaint*. This and the other Pamphlets are witnesses to the contrary: Could Men complain more publickly, more unjustly, or more pathetically and maliciously than they do. He saith also, *that some of them suffered the loss of Children*; which is above made appear to be false, in the only instance that was brought. That they suffered without any Authority is not denied; because then there was no Authority in the Nation: It was in a state of *Anarchy*: For the right that he saith they have to their by-past Stipends; we shall not grudge that they get what was legally due to them. But if the Au-

thority of the Nation (in the Convention or Parliament) have determined otherwise, I know not where their Legal right can be founded, but this I leave to Lawyers to consider.

§ 7. *The fulsome and flattering Expressions in the Presbyterian Address to King James for their Liberty, their approving of the Dispensing Power, which he taxeth, page 9. are his own imaginations, other Men can see no such thing in that Address. That they never preached against the disorders of the Rabble, is false: Though we thought not fit to make that our constant Theme. And if but few did it, it was because they who were Actors in that Scene, little regarded the preaching of the sober Presbyterians: And they should have lost their sweet Words. These practices of the Rabble were publicly spoken against by Ministers both before they were acted, for preventing them, and after, for reprovng them, and preventing the like. That the Presbyterians possessed their places when called to them, it was their Right; both by their standing Relation to their people, from whom they had been thrust away in Anno 1662. And also by the Act of Parliament giving all Ministers then put out, regrefs to their Charges: And indeed they who had been by the Bishops put into their places were Intruders, and if any entered to other places, on the Call of the people, to which they had not such former Relation, there was no blame; because there being no probable regrefs for the former Incumbents, it was not reasonable that the people should continue destitute of the Gospel. Beside that there was never a Relation of Pastor and people between them and these Flocks, they never having consented to such a Relation. For what he saith of the *Right of Patrons*, I think there were but few Ministers Fixed before it was legally made void: And if they were, we think that Right was only founded on the Law; but was contrary to Christs Institution: And it was known to be about expiring, and therefore it was not contrary to a good Conscience, to accept of a Call to a people, without the Patron. It is true, in that Case they could have no Right to the Stipend: But the Consent of Minister and people, the Authority of a competent Church Judicatory being interposed, could well fix a Relation between Minister and People, without the Patron. He doth next fall heavily on the Convention of Estates (for these Men hide not their Treasonable Speeches against the present Government of the State;) That it is no wonder that many thought that the Design of some who were zealous for the Revolution, was more to destroy the Episcopal Clergy, than to settle the Nation, or preserve our Religion, Liberties*

Liberties and Properties. This I leave to them to Answer who have power to correct such petulancy: He further latheth the Convention and the Council, for their Acts with respect to the Ministers cast out in the *Western Shires*. Neither shall I meddle with him on this Head: He hath not yet done with our Rulers: But blameth them for the *Proclamation for Praying for King William and Queen Mary*. And punishing Men for not obeying it so suddenly. This I have answered on Letter 2. Sect. 17. All that followeth to page 14. is already answered in the forecited place: Only he hath a new Argument in Defence of them who did not read or pray, viz. That the *Proclamation* was not sent to them from the Bishops. As if the Estates could not imploy what Officers they pleased to Authorize, for signifying their Mind to the Ministers, page 14. Even the King shall not escape his Censure; because, while he extended Clemency to Criminals, he did not so to the Clergy: Who were neither willing to obey his Commands nor pray for him; nor so much as own Him for their King. And it is indeed an Act of Clemency which few Kings ever shewed, to allow such to be in publick Churches, and to have the conduct of the Consciences of his Subjects: I am sure this is not the way to have the people principled with Loyalty; though that was the main Theme that these Men insisted on in the former Reigns. What followeth is his observation on a Debate in Parliament, about imposing the Oath of Allegiance, and why it was not imposed on the Clergy: He saith, *It was out of respect to the Presbyterian Preachers, lest they should scruple it: They being unwilling to come under Allegiance to King William till first he had settled their Church Government*: And he thinks some will not take it till the Covenant be renewed. Here is bold judging and censuring the secret thoughts and purposes of the Estates: As also most calumnious Imputations on the Presbyterians; Did ever any of them refuse the Oath of Allegiance? Have not many of them (even as many as were required on any occasion) chearfully taken it? And that though the Covenant be not renewed, Did ever any of them move such a scruple about it? Yea it is manifest, that it is not their principle so to bargain with their Kings about Allegiance: For they were ready to swear it (and did when called) to Kings who unsettled their Church Government; and who enacted the abjuring of the Covenant. What followeth page 15, 16. about Ministers being deprived for not reading and praying, is answered in Letter 2. Sect. 17. He odiously compareth the States dealing with the Clergy, with that of the French with the Protestants there, who

sawed

saved their Life and Fortune if they change their Religion ; but Compli-ers here are turned out by the Rabble. Ans. If he can shew that this is done here by Authority, as in *France* the Persecution is acted ; or that the Protestants in *France* suffered in a time of *Anarchy*, by a people that had been so barbarously injured and enraged by them : Then should he speak to the purpose ; otherwise his parallel doth no ways hold. They had made themselves justly loathsome, and a burden to the people, who took their opportunity to be rid of them, without such Barbarous usage of them as they had suffered from them. And the Estates thought it not fit to impose that burden again, on a people who had been so crush'd by it ; what is there here that hath any Affinity with the Case of the Sufferings in *France* ?

§ 8. He pretendeth page 16, and 17. to remove a Mis-information, given to them of *England* : That the Clergy were not deprived by the Council for not reading and praying, unless they were Immoral in their Conversation : And from this he laboureth to vindicate them. Much of which is answered above ; only the Reader may know, that this was never alledged, nor given as the reason of their deprivation by any of us : Whatever might possibly be talked in *England*, by them who knew little of our Affairs. The Council did not consider their Immorality, nor freedom from it, but only their obedience or disobedience to the Law. His story about Bishop *Lighton* will not Vindicate the Western Clergy from gross and multiplied Immoralities : But that is not now the thing under our consideration. That Scandals were represented at Court, as the ground of their deprivation by the Council, is as injurious and false, as any thing that can be said. The plurality of Episcopal Ministers above the Presbyterians, he seemeth to brag of : But is it any wonder, when twenty eight years ago many had complied with Episcopacy, and all that did not, were driven away, and in that long time many of them were removed by death. Was it not so at the Reformation from Popery ? How far did the number of Popish Priests exceed that of Protestant Ministers ? But what he hence inferreth, hath no weight ; viz. That many of the Episcopal Ministers must be removed lest they should over-vote the others : For a more rational and sure course was taken to obviate it ; viz. That the Government should be settled only in the hands of Presbyterians, and such as they shall receive ; which he, or his Fellow Censurer of the State had above complained of, and we have vindicated. He concludeth this Narrative with a warning to the Church of England

England of the Enmity of Presbyterians against them, and their hazard from us. And indeed the strain of these Pamphlets is mostly a complaint against the King and Parliament, and all the Authority of this Nation, and an Appeal to the Church of England for deliverance from this Yoke : And I hope our Rulers will consider them accordingly.

§ 9. We now come to consider the Authors several Collections of Papers; in which he hath been at a great deal of pains, but to little, or bad purpose ; as I hope by Examination of them shall appear. His first Collection is of accounts that he hath had from his Complices, a Company of Men avowed and malicious Enemies of all Presbyterians, concerning their Sufferings from them; and all this attested by themselves, as I above observed. He beginneth with the Story of Mr. Bell of Kilmarnock which I have above answered on Letter second. Next he cometh to the Presbytery of Hamiltoun : Where it seems he findeth three : Mr. John Dalgliesh of Evendal, Mr. James Crichtoun of Kilbryd, Mr. Angus Mackintosh at Sten-house, whose Gowns were torn, and they discharged to preach : Attested by Dr. Robert Scot, Mr. George Leslie, and Mr. John Dennistoun. To all which I give no other Answer but what hath been said on the like occasion, That the Presbyterians are not to answer for such practices, which were done by such as Sober Presbyterians do not own, nor are owned by them, but rather hated and opposed : As also that so many lying Stories of this kind have been told by him, that it is not worth the while to enquire into the truth of these. Men use to slight what is asserted by a common Liar. We have next a general account of the Ministers of the Presbytery of Irwin ; that all their Houses have been assaulted, their Gowns torn, and they discharged to preach ; many of their Wives and Children turned out of Doors, like to starve by Hunger and Cold in the Winter ; some forced to fly and lurk, that they cannot meet to make known their Grievances : Only three or four give these accounts from their own knowledge, and certain information. Signed Charles Littlejohn Minister of Larg, Alexander Laing Minister at Stewartoun.

One may easily answer all this without particular information : Considering the veracity that is to be found in this Pamphlet, viz. Here is nothing but Generals, and that by report : Personal knowledge is pretended but for little of what is Asserted. And we have cause to think, that these were none of them who are of our Communion who Acted these things. Then follows the Sufferings of the Presbytery of Glasgow in the persons of Mr. Russel at Govan,

Mr.

Mr. Finny at Carthcart; which two Stories are answered and found to be forgeries, on Letter 2. Mr. Blair at Rutherglen, Mr. Gilbert Mufhet at Cumernald, Mr. David Mill at Cumernald; which we may rationally judge to be of the same stamp: Neither have we time to search into all the groundless Tales that he thinketh fit either to invent, or to take up from them that devise them. But that which he laboureth to set off by the Circumstances of it, is, that January 17. 1689. A Rabble, mostly Women, came with a design to drag the Minister out of the Pulpit; he being warned and forbearing, and returning from the Church, was assaulted, his Gown and other Cloaths torn. The same day Mr. Alexander George had his Doors broken, and he being upon his Sick-bed, they had dragged him out of his Bed, if the Provost with ten Men had not come to his Relief. Next Sabbath, January 20. there was no Sermon in the City, on the 22d they sent a threatening Letter, forbidding all Ministers to preach on the highest peril; this is attested by Alexander George, John Sage, the Ministers of Glasgow. All this is answered above.

§. 10. Another Paper of History he setteth down page 41. of *the Sufferings of the Presbytery of Paislay, upon the Bedele of Paislay; on the Minister there, on the Minister of Kilbarken, And how Mr. Houstoun usurped the Pulpit of Eastwood: This attested by Robert Fullertoun Moderator, and John Taylor Minister at Paislay. The answer of all this we take out of the Accusation it self. It was done by Mr. Houstoun, and his Party: A man who not only is disowned by the Soberest sort of Presbyterians, but even by the Cameronians; as of most unsound Principles, and most immoral practices. Followeth a Letter Signed by four Ministers George Gregory, Francis Fordyce, William Irwine, Minister at Kirkmichael, John Hog Minister at Ochiltry. What is not repeated out of the former Stories, and answered before, is, the People of the Meeting-house Battering and Bruising the Minister of Kirkmichaels Man-servant, commanding him to remove with what was his Masters from the House. Ans. It is witnessed under the Hands of David Bell, James Cathcart, Thomas Craig, William Niven; all of that Parish: That they were present when one Robert Donaldson with some others, came to the Minister of Kirkmichaels House, and that they did not beat, or use any Violence to the Ministers Man servant: But only took the Communion Cups from him, and that they two drank together, and shook Hands at Parting: And that the said Servant lived there peaceably a year after, and disposed of the Crop of his Masters Glebe. It is also witnessed under the Hand of John Kennedy, and*
George

George Monaght; that the forementioned *Robert Donaldson* who was said to use Violence in the house of the Minister of *Kirkmichael*, was a common Robber, and had Robbed several Houses in *Carrick*: And that he, nor his Complices did belong to no Meeting-House: That they apprehended him and carried him before the Bailly Deputy of *Carrick*, who sent him to Prison. Is it not a malicious Lye, to impute this Fact to the Presbyterians of the Meeting-house? Followeth the possessing of some Churches: Which is above Answered. Then we have a large History Signed by the Minister of *Livingston*, *Mr. George Honeyman*, and *John Park Clerk* to the Synod of *Edinburgh*: How 30 Armed men came to his House, Frighted his Wife, who had lyen but eight days in Child-bed, carried away what they thought fit: Took his Horse and the Beddels Horse (which they sent back next day) a month after they searched the House for the Minister; sometime after that they Summoned him to Remove: All this we deny to have been done by any of our Communion. Yea the Summons given to him and others for removing (a Copy of which our Author doth furnish us with) doth shew it was done by a party of People who had been enraged by the cruel Persecutions that they had suffered from these Men. We are far from approving such Irregularities, but the World will not think it strange that they, who instead of feeding their flock, had worried them, should meet with such things from a People so highly provoked. I can produce a large Paper of the manifold Sufferings of that Parish, by *Mr. Honeymans* Malice and influence: Attested by about thirty Hands, but I forbear, to shun tediousness. Such another story we have of *Mr. Man Minister* at *Bathgate* whose House they searched, also a Neighbours House, at last found him, and with threatening by drawn Swords, and Guns presented, demanded of him the Utensils of the Church, and Records of the Kirk-Session, Tore his Gown, and Summoned him to remove. This hath the like Attestation with the former, *Ans.* The People of *Bathgate* never owned *Mr. Man* he being placed there only by the Bishop, without the consent either of Patron or People, only in time of most severe Persecution, many out of fear came to hear him; they were highly provoked by his Persecuting of them. Of which there are clear and great Instances; in his stirring up the Magistrates, and assisting the Souldiers, to Ruine them. Next *Mr. Norman Mckenzie*, Minister at *Mid Calder*, and *John Park*, do witness, that January 27. being the Lords day, after Sermon, Eight Armed Men came to his House, but were repulsed by some Gentlemen, who were there: In which scuffle three were

wounded. *That Feb. 1. They broke up the house, frightened his Wife : Said they would see all his Bonds : One of them Thomas Livingstoun, said he behoved to have his Father's Bond, for a Summ that he owed to the Minister : Finding no Papers they carried away the Church Trensils, which they committed to the Custody of one in the Town, they Summoned him to remove : also they testify (which is also testified in the former Narrative) that none of these were of the Parish.* Ans. As we do not approve any of these things being Acted without Authority ; so we find this to be a Lying accusation : For the Men who Feb. 1. came to the House, carried civilly : Telling his Wife she needed not fear : And that they would do no harm to her, or any Person in the House. The Bond that *Thomas Livingstoun* sought for, was a Bond that the Minister had forced his Father to give for a Fine imposed on him for Non-conformity. *Also Mr. George Robertson, Minister at Westcalders, had his House searched for Arms, and an old Sword taken from him ; and was summoned to remove, Witnessed by himself and John Park, ut supra.* Ans. if this was done, the General answers above given is enough to vindicate the Presbyterians in General from the blame of it. and the time of confusion, and provocations, that that poor suffering People had from most of that Party, may make us cease to wonder at it.

§ 11. In his second Collection of Papers p. 50. we have account of the practice of the Rabble, after the Princes Declaration, against some Ministers who afterward were deprived by the Council ; by which instances he would make it appear, how little the Presbyterians regarded Authority, when it tended to restrain their disorders. A general answer to all that is said under this, may be gathered from what hath been before discoursed : viz, That much of what is alledged is either Lies, or Truth disguised, and what was really done, was by Persons whose Actions we are not concerned to defend. He beginneth with the Tumult at Glasgow, Feb. 17. 1689. Which is answered, *Sect. 5.* The next is of Mr. Gideon Brown Minister at Smalholme, attested by himself alone. But others are offered as witnesses if need be. Where it is Narrated, *that George Dickson a profest Cameronian (which is afterward said to be a Preacher in a meeting) A Correr to the Laird of Smalholme, first summoned Mr. Brown, to remove from the Church, and desist from Preaching : Afterward forced him out of the Pulpit, using violence to his Son who offered to defend him. He denieth that he persecuted them as they alledged ; but that often he saved them from the Last of the Law.* This story hath its answer in it self : For the man was a Cameronian, and the Actions of that party we ne-

ver approved, neither can, nor will we defend them : besides, the parish do witness that he was a violent persecutor, and give instances of it under the hands of credible witnesses: Which shall be shewed to any who desireth to be informed. Our next instance is of Mr. *William Bullo*, Minister at *Srobo*; whom the Rabble used most Barbarously, all the Winter, and frighted his Wife and Children into Sicknes, and he was forced to lodge in the Fields in the Winter Weather. About the beginning of April, as he was riding through a Village in the Parish, there came out of the House of the Preacher in the Meeting house, his Servant, and a Rabble, who with Swords and Guns charged him to Stand, he fleeing from them, they fired Guns after him, they mounting on Horse Back, pursued and took him, they threatened to shoot him, and bid him Pray before he should Die. When he told them they were in Passion; They said, you Damn'd Rogue, do ye admonish us, so they Beat him with their Swords, and said they would spare him for that Night, and Sentence, and execute him next Morning, so, they convened many of the Parish, caused tear his Gown, discharged him to Preach : And on the day that he should have read the Proclamation, they hindred him by force from entring the Church, yet was he after deprived by the Council for not Reading and Praying.

Ans. In this Narrative, are many Lies : which is attested by Mr. *William Ruffel*, Minister at *Srobo* : As that his Wife and Children fell sick by fear : None of them were sick that year. That he lodged in the Fields; for he never lodged a night in the Fields, only one night two young men came to his house, he was not within, but in a Neighbours house hard by. His Wife said to them that he was in *Edinburgh*, he withdrew a little and returned as soon as they were gone, and said that he would not have fled if he had thought they were so few, but have Pistoled them both; it is also false that any came out of the Preachers house on him as he Rode; but these two young men being provoked with his speaking of Pistoling them, came out of another House, and called to speak with him; He fled, the Preachers man came out to see what the Fray was, one of the young Men followed him on Horseback, did no harm to him, but reasoned the Case with him : He alledging that all the Honeft men in the Parish owned him : They brought ten or twelve whom he Named as such, who yet disowned him. It is most false that he was hindred to read the Proclamation; he did read a part of it : It is true some moved to hinder him from Preaching, but the Presbyterian Minister restrained them. It is a gross untruth, that he was willing to read and Pray, and yet deprived for it; For he said before the Council that he had not Prayed for King *William* and Queen *Mary*: That his Gown was torn, is also a gross Lye.

§ 12. The Story of Mr. Little (which next followeth) is above answered, in Answer to *Account of Persecution Letter 2. Sect. 13.* Next we have account of the Sufferings of Mr. *Archibald Ferguson Minister at Kirkpatrick, whom the Rabble, Men and Women, Assaulted in his House: When he calmly asked the reason, they knocked him on the Head with a Pistol, so that he fell: His Wife daily expecting the pains of Child-birth, they knocked down with the Butt-end of a Musket: He received many merciless Blows, and was sorely bruised: Himself they dragged into a puddle; the Women cut and tore off his Cloaths; even to the uncovering of his Nakedness; beat him on the Shins with a Club, commanded him to be gone, and forced him in his Wounds to leave his House, Family, and Church.* Before I examine the matter of this Story, I take notice of the bitter Sarcasms, and cruel Mockings against all the Presbyterians, with which it is interspersed, as if this Fact were to be charged on the Party, who yet do abhor such practices as much as any Men can do. He saith these Barbarities were committed by the pretended Godly Presbyterians: That they have separated themselves from the Society of the Catholic Church; because they do not observe Easter with the same superstition as some others do. He addeth, that the *Womens Daggers were prepared for a thorough Reformation:* And many such bitter Reflections he throweth out against us all; from the irregularities of a wild Party, whom persecution from his Party had made mad, and in whom we are no further concerned than to Lament their Principles and Practices. A further Answer was delayed when this was written, expecting Information from such as know the Circumstances of this Story: But that Account not being as yet come to Hand, when this sheet is printing off (by whose fault I know not) I can only say, that the many Lying Stories that are in this Book, may derogate from the Credibility of this: If it be true, we abhor the Fact, and wish that the Actors may be brought to condign Punishment for such Inhumanity.

§ 13. In his third Collection of Papers (which concerneth them who complied, and yet suffered) he beginneth with Mr. *William Hamilton, who first at Irwin, then at Kirk-newtown, was put from his House and Church, by the Rabble, and very hardly used.* Ans. That these things acted against him were not the deed of the Presbyterians, nor approved by the Church, is evident from this, that Mr. *Hamilton* is in good esteem among the Presbyterians, and is now received as one of themselves, into a share of the Government with them: Wherefore if such things were done against him, it was not by the sober Presbyterians, but by a sort of Men who are not of our Communion

Communion, and who have shewed dislike against us also. For the Truth of what he alledged to have been done, I can meet with none who can affirm what our Author saith; and therefore have cause to suspect it as of the same strain with others of his Affirmations. He telleth us next how Mr. Samuel Nimmo was hindered to Preach by some of the Earl of Argyle's Regiment. If this were true, it was the Deed of some *Cameronians*, not approved by the Presbyterians. And I hope hindring a man to Preach (tho we allow not that it be done in a disorderly way) doth not amount to so horrid a Persecution as he crieth out of. His next complaint concerneth Mr. Selkirk at Glenholm in Tweddale, who Read and Prayed, was threatened by some of the meanest of the People, to remove from his Dwelling, obtained from them a fortnight for that end, some put another Lock on the Church door to keep him out: Of this he had no Redress. This we are far from allowing; but still here is nothing like the French Dra-gooning. He saith that he complained and had no Redress: But we neither know whom to blame, nor how to make enquiry about the Truth of it, seeing he is not pleased to let us know who did thus deny Justice to him. It is sufficiently attested that this was done by Strangers: that they took two of Mr. Selkirks Elders into the House with them, who might witness that they used no violence, and that he and they parted peaceably: And that afterward he dimitted his Charge, and the Presbytery gave him a Testimonial. Mr. Burgess (he doth not tell where he was Minister) is the next subject of Complaint: His Church was possessed by the Rabble, sent by Mr. Walker Preacher in the Meeting-house; by the connivance of Mr. Mowat, who is Old and Infirm: The Heretors were offended that Mr Walker invaded Mr. Mowats right. The Rabble hindered Mr. Burgess to Preach; and when he objected King Williams Authority, they spoke of it with contempt. Ans. Mr. Mowat, and the Parish had called Mr. Walker to his help: The people hearing of the Act for restoring the old Ministers (not considering that it was only Voted, but had not the Royal Assent, which it afterward had) met in the Church; Mr. Walker dissuaded them: Yet was forced to Preach to them there: There was no Tumult: the whole Parish was met: Mr. Burgess's Bedle opened the Church door to them. It is false, that any of the people did condemn King William's Authority: There were indeed three young Men, who some days after, discharged Mr. Burgess to Preach: But this was not approved by the rest: nor was ever any violence offered to him: What the Paper saith of Arms, and beating a Drum, is false: The Parish had been

at a Rendezvous; whence they came to a Burial, but that they made use of Arms or Drum, at or near Mr. *Burgess's* House, is altogether false. The sufferings of Mr. *David Spence* followeth, That He was discharged to Preach in January 1689. by Strangers, yet continuing till April, he was forcibly hindered to Preach and to Read the Proclamation, on the day appointed for it, though he was willing to do it: On complaint, he had protection, from the Committee of Estates; yet in September he was deprived for not Reading. *Ans.* In the Records of Council I find him deprived for that he confessed he had neither Read nor Prayed: But not a word of the Plea he used for his Omission: So that this is to be look'd on as a gross prevarication, and malicious design to defame the Government: For the Rabble hindering him to Preach before he was deprived: We do not approve it, nor was it done by any of our Communion. What is said of some Ministers in the Presbytery of *Sirranrawer*, we shall meet with it in a Pamphlet that peculiarly insisteth on their sufferings; wherefore I now pass over it. Mr. *Francis Scot* of *Tweed-mure* was cast out by the Rabble. This we do not defend, nor are obliged to Answer for it. Mr. *Alison* of *Kilbucho* was cast out after he had been cleared by the Council, having given all Obedience, and his Goods were destroyed by some Women; and a Presbyterian possesseth his Church, neither can he get any redress. What application he hath made for redress, and who hath been faulty in denying it to him we cannot enquire, for our Author is not particular; but thought it safest to Reproach the Presbyterians in general Terms. All that remains in this third Collection of Papers is some Letters sent to London to my Lord *Elphinston* complaining of the injustice done to Mr. *Paul Gelly* Minister of *Airth*: In that he was deprived by the Council on the Testimony of two perjured Persons, whereas he had given all Obedience, and he hath a good Testimony from most of the Parish. *Ans.* They that testify for him are of his own party: They did not testify any thing before the Council in his Vindication: The Witnesses against him were neither accused before any Court, nor convicted of any thing that should derogate from the Credibility of their Testimony: They testified not only that he did not Read and Pray, but that he prayed for the Restoration of King *James*, and exhorted the people to pray so in private: And said, That he expected a Reformation, but they had got a wicked Tyranny, and Ungodly Rulers: And that people were not secure of Life and Fortune; all this is attested by the Records of the Council.

§ 14. In his fourth and last Collection of Papers, he hath the Proclamations, Acts of Convention and Council, Addressses, &c. That he thinketh may bespatter the Presbyterians: These Papers need none of my Apology for them. Wherefore I shall only take notice of his little Remarks on them, whereby he doth most petulantly reproach the Government, as well as the Presbyterians. Some Observations he maketh on the Proclamation of the Estates for praying for King *William* and Queen *Mary*, which are above answered: One I now take notice of, which is, *That the Presbyterian Preachers were not questioned for neglecting to read the Proclamation, and to pray according to it, though others were.* *Ans.* I know not that any of them were guilty of this neglect: And if any were, there was no Information against them; and therefore no punishment could follow. He next dealeth with the Addressses of the Presbyterians to King *James* for the Liberty granted them by him; and taketh notice, *that they were ready to comply with a Popish Prince, and did not keep their promise of Duty and Allegiance to him.* I take no notice of his profane mocking, in the strain of what he saith: But to the thing, I answer, They no farther complied with a Popish Prince, than to live peaceably under him, and to use the Gospel-priviledge that they had been violently deprived of, which was now restored to them; and had not his party their Liberty also secured to them, by the same King? Yea they concurred to set him up, and to advance his Supremacy and Arbitrary Power, by which he was put in Capacity to destroy our Religion, which we never did: For promises of Duty and Allegiance, we kepted them so long as he was King, but when the Nation laid him aside, and chused another, the obligation of our Allegiance was changed, and we bestowed it where the Nation had placed it: As also did the Church of *England* their great Patrons. But this Man and his Complices, declare their dislike of our King, and Civil Government, on all occasions. as much as they do against our Church way. His next effort against the Convention and Government, is from a Letter written by the Viscount of *Dundee*, whom he calleth *The Great*, (which is on the Matter an owning of that Rebellion that he was the Head of) the Letter and this Authors remark on it, tend to condemn the Convention of Estates of Injustice. This matter I have above touched. It is false that he was living in peace, and that he was in hazard of his Life by the Rabble. He had gathered a formidable party to destroy the Convention of Estates, and they gathered a force for their security: And on this, he and others went away

away in Arms, and gathered a party in the *Highlands*. But on these things I insist not, my business being mainly to vindicate the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, in her Principles and Actings. The Act of Council December 24. 1689. I have vindicated on Letter 2. He is pleased (and reckoneth it modesty so to do) to call it a great stretch of Justice: Some Mens Necks have been made to stretch for a less Crime, than thus to reproach the Government. He saith, page 85. *That the Ministers ousted by the Rabble are cast out of the protection of the State.* That is no further true, than that they were not reposed: The Reasons of which are given on Letter 2. It is maliciously represented, *That the Rabble, and all their Enemies, were invited to be Witnesses against them who yet were in place.* For all were invited, but none were admitted but such as were unexceptionable Witnesses, *Boni & legales homines.* Would he have none but his own party to be Witnesses against them who despised the Government? He would fain say something against the Prince of *Orange's Declaration*, page 90. but can find nothing; but that the Rabble grew strong by it, and they who had taken Arms (who were indeed King James's party) were forced to Disband: This is that which grieveth him. What followeth of the Conventions thanks to them that had Guarded them against *Dumdee's Plot*, and his observations on it, is discussed above on Letter 2. He observeth nothing on the Proclamation for the Fast, Aug. 24. 1689. But that he calleth it a Canting Proclamation. A word of contempt that these Men use for any thing that looketh like serious Religion. And that Mr. Ramsay, and Doctor Gardine were deprived for not Reading it: Which is false: For it was for praying for King James, as the account which he himself giveth doth make manifest. All that he observeth on the Proclamation ordering to whom the Bishops Rents should be paid (they being now laid aside) is, *That Alexander Hamiltoun of Kinkel, who was employed as receiver for St. Andrews, was at Bothwel Bridge, and by the Clemency of the then Government had his Life spared.* If all this were true what doth it make against the Presbyterians. He is known to be a faithful Man, and why might not the Government employ him, seeing the former Government had spared him: But in truth, it was not so much the Clemency of the former Government, as no Crime could be proved against him, that saved his Life. His last Paper, for it seemeth that he is now at a Close, and can say no more, is a draught of an Act for the Establishment of the Government of the Church, given in to the Parliament by the Kings Commissioner, which, he saith,

that

that the Presbyterians would not admit of, because it restrained them from meddling in State Affairs. *Ans.* Many other Acts, as well as this, were given in, being drawn by private hands, to be considered by the Parliament, and were rejected or amended. That the Parliament rejected any of them, it was because they saw them, or somewhat in them, to be inconvenient; but that he will fix on the particular cause, and lay this on the Presbyterians, is faulty boldness: Not only meddling with the designs of the Legislators, which is not fit for a private Person, but with the secret thoughts of Men, which is fit for no Creature.

§ 15. The conclusion of his Book, consisting of five or six pages, I shall not much be concerned with; he there, more than before (which was needless) venteth his Spleen against the present Government of the State; And that in very undecent terms. He dealeth in most of it, with the Observator, whom I leave to plead his own cause. Though I have above Asserted, and Vindicated the Truth of most things for which he challengeth the Observator. His note about the Earl of Crasford's Letter, is a groundless Cavil. His Lordship doth not own that the Council took probation of Crimes of another Nature, beside not Reading and Praying; but on the contrary, said, that though they who framed the Libels against the Episcopal Ministers did ignorantly, in their Libels, accuse them, either for their Opinion about Church Government, or Immoralities in their Conversation; yet, no regard was had to these, nor any question made about them. He next taketh to task a Book Intituled, *A brief and true account of the sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Episcopalians since the year 1660.* which he saith, is written by a true-paced Presbyterian: And imputeth all the Assertions, and severity of Stile in that Book, to the Presbyterians. This is an unfair, and injurious, and false imputation: Presbyterians disown both the Stile, and many Principles vented in that Book; it was written by a Cameronian, while that party stood at a distance from the sober Presbyterians, and from the Generality of them who bear that Name, as much as from the Prelatists. Though on the other hand, we know that there are many undeniable truths in it, as to the matter of Fact concerning these Sufferings; which I wish he, or any of his party, would undertake to disprove. But it is strange that this Gentleman should quarrel the stile of that Book, seeing it is exactly conform to his own, in the bitterness and ill nature that appeareth in it: Only things are not there so foully mis-represented as in his Paper. The Queries

with which he shutteth up this his Work, we are the less concerned in, because most of them are built upon the principles of that Book which we do not own: And others of them, on some Actings of this Church in a time when both contending parties run a little too high in the heat of debate: Of which I have spoken what is sufficient in my *Former Vindication*: Only a few things, not met with in that Paper, I now take notice of, *That the Presbyterians have risen twice in Arms in King William's time*, is an impudent and false Assertion: For the first time that he mentioneth, it was a Rabble of *Cameronians*, not in a Body, but here and there, to throw out some of the Clergy who had severely oppressed them: Of which I have told my Sentiment above. The other, *A formidable number in an Hostile manner, making an Address to the Council, telling them, That they would not lay down their Arms till the Council had discharged all Judicatories to pronounce any Sentence in Favour of Episcopal Ministers.* This was never heard of before; and certainly this Gentleman hath either Dreamed it, or Invented it. Page 107. He hath amassed a heap of gross Lies, viz. *That they had Voted King William out of the Supremacy: That they have Usurped it to themselves, having without his leave Convened at Edinburgh, and Voted themselves into a free General Assembly. That they daily draw up Instructions for regulating the Parliament: That they Meet and Adjourn at their pleasure,* For the first of these, it was not the Ministers, but the Parliament (to which the King gave his Royal Assent) which Voted away the Supremacy: And that, not any Supremacy that is due to any Man on Earth; but such a one as the Pope had usurped over the Church of God; and which some of our Kings had assumed, and under the former Government had been screwed up to that height that the King might overturn our Religion at his pleasure. And it is highly to the Commendation of our Gracious King, that he was pleased to give to God that which was his, and to reserve only to himself what was *Cæsars*. For the second, the Presbyterians usurp no Supremacy, no Legislative, nor Coercive Power: They pretend to no more but a Ministerial Power, in declaring the Laws of Christ, by his Authority, and in executing the Censures which he hath appointed for the breakers of these Laws. Thirdly, It is most false that they convened in the General Assembly without his leave, they had an express Act of Parliament for it, neither did the Assembly Meet or Adjourn, without the Kings Commissioner at any time; other Judicatories are by Law allowed to Meet and Adjourn, as they think fit; and therefore

fore their so doing is not without the Kings leave. We think it no small mercy to have the Magistrates Countenance to our Meetings; tho' we think to deny any Intrinsic Power in the Church, to meet about the Affairs of Religion, were to condemn the Apostles and to allow Rulers, if they should be either open or secret Enemies to the Truth, a power to Ruin all, at their pleasure. Fourthly, That they either daily, or at all, draw up Instructions for Regulating the Parliament, is an Assertion so false and malicious, as none but a Man of this Authors Temper could be capable of: Nor can I imagine from whence he could take rise for such a Fancie. He hath another foul Untruth; *That the Covenant is again Voted the Standard of all pure Religion* I desire to know of him where, when, or by whom, this was done: For they that live in Scotland know nothing of it. His talk of some holding that King Charles fell from the Crown, because he brake the Covenant, and King James had no Right, because he took it not; might perhaps be the principle of some of the wildest of the Hill-men, but never were the Opinions of sound Presbyterians. His third Query deserveth little Answer. We are far from thinking King William an Idolater; tho' we dislike the English Service: And our principles are known, that we owe Loyalty, and have paid it, even to an Idolatrous, (that is, a Popish) King. The fourth Query tendeth to engage the Rulers to bear down the Presbyterians in the North of Ireland; that Popery might prevail there; against which they have been the greatest Bulwark of that Nation. His fifth Query quarrelleth the Dissenters in England for praying for their Brethren in Scotland; how reasonably this is blamed, let the Reader judge. I never heard that they prayed for Scotland, as their Mother Church. In his sixth Query, he shamelessly blameth Presbyterians for being against Toleration, (this I have answered in my former Vindication) whereas his own party are as rigid that way as any, except Papists, or these in Japan. For his last Query, which concerneth the Moderation of Presbyterians; it is our design and endeavour to grow in this, and in other Graces; and not to confine our selves to our own attainments, or to what others had attained who went before us: And to set no bounds to it but what the Scripture setteth. I hope all this considered, the design of his Queries is lost; which is to represent the Presbyterians as not Loyal, nor firm to King William. Many wise Men think that he hath few in this Nation, beside them, who are Cordially for his Interest.

A N ANSWER

To a Pamphlet, Intituled,

A late Letter concerning the Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland, printed 1691.

THE party finding some acceptance with their easie Believers, of their former Lying and Reproachful prints, thought fit to add this, as a further knock of the Hammer, to drive the Nail to the head: That it might now be beyond debate with them who will give them Credit without trying the Truth or Ingenuity of what is reported; that the Presbyterians are a Cruel party, and have oppressed the Clergy. And indeed this piece is behind none of the rest in effronted and bold Lies: And to say this, might be a just Refutation of the whole Book: Tho' no more were said. If they who know our Affairs can but read the Book with impartial Eyes, and if Strangers will give equal Credit to the one party as to the other: Yet lest they should say, that there is no Answer to it; I shall with much brevity take notice of such passages in it as are most material. Page 4. There is a notable Lie, viz. He will have it thought that *there were no more Nonconformists in the Presbytery of Stranrawer, but two Women and one Minister* (whom yet he doth not own for such, but saith he was so reputed) this is an Untruth so broad-faced, as may disparage the veracity of the Author, and make all his assertions be disbelieved. For many, if not most, of the Inhabitants of the Parishes in that Presbytery, were Fined, Imprisoned, and Ruined, for their Nonconformity: *Dragoons* were kept there, as a necessary means to force the people to comply with the Episcopal way. An Account

Account can be shewed of above 1000 *l.* Sterling levied of the Parish of *Glenluce*, for Nonconformity: And scarce a Family in *Stranrawer* of any Note, but were Fined and Imprisoned, till they paid their Fines. He who after such an impudent and broad Lie, will believe any thing that this Author writeth, on the Authority of his Testimony, may also believe that there hath been no Persecution of late years in *France*. And if any of the distressed people did at last comply, it doth not more follow, that they were Episcopal, than it can be concluded, that all the *French* Protestants are Papists who were forced to be present at Mass: That there was no Presbyterian Preacher in these parts except Mr. Bell, is not strange; seeing by the fury of the Persecutors none might be seen: That he had freedom in his mind to hear the Incumbents that then were, and that when the Liberty was given, he set up a Meeting-house, is a practice not to be blamed: The people generally either could not hear, or did it *renitente Conscientia*: And it was but reasonable that a Minister who before could not edifie them, should do it when a liberty was granted for so doing.

§ 2. It is also a gross and malicious Lie, page 5. That William Torbran fled to Ireland for the Murther that he had committed on a Child of Mr. Hutchison's. Mr. Hutchison never charged Mr Torbran with the Murther of his Child; but William Torbran was forced to flee to Ireland to escape the severe Persecution that he endured from the Souldiers at the instigation of the Minister of the Parish, such a bold Calumny might be of dangerous Consequence, if *Lex talionis* were put in due Execution. Page 5, 6. He telleth a long Story, about Building a Meeting-house, and calling another to be Minister (at Stranrawer) than Mr. Bell, about which I have no Information; neither is it material, or to our purpose. But what he saith of *Lairds and Ladies by Threatnings compelling their Tennants, and by other indirect means prevailing with others, to concur for maintaining that Meeting*, is a shameless Lie. It's well known, that the People of that Countrey did forwardly, and chearfully go along in that design; and generally the meaner sort shewed as much Zeal that way as they of better Fashion did. If he had mentioned who these Gentlemen were who made gain by the Collection for maintaining the House: Or who the two were who beat their Tennants first to take the Test, and after to leave the Church and go to the Meeting: The truth, or falshood, of these Assertions might have been inquired into: But since it hath not pleased him so to do, I hope it will be no breach of Charity to look on them as slanderous Forgers.

ries, like unto many passages in his Book already noted, or to be noted. It is not enough for this Gentleman to reproach the Presbyterians, but *page 7.* He most maliciously beliieth his Nation, as if there were neither Law nor Justice in *Scotland*, nor any remedy for such as are oppressed: While he saith, That *they deal no otherwise with their Farmers than with Slaves; that if the Tennant die Rich, the Laird must be Tutor to the Children.* I know not what this Author hath observed, but other Scots men are unacquainted with these things: And if there be oppression (as alas there is too much every where) I am sure his own party have a large share of it among them. What he so Tragically Painteth out, of Preachers and People going through Parishes, where there were no Meeting Houles; Amounteth to no more than this, that the Ministers were so charitable to People who could not maintain a Minister for themselves, as to go to them, and help them, by appointing their Meetings where such destitute People might attend them.

§ 3. He telleth a long Story, *pag. 7.* Of the Presbyterians Arming themselves, and inventing false Reports to give countenance for their so doing: and that the design of it was, to ruine the Clergy: This Allegation is above answered, being brought in also in some of the former Letters: And himself opposeth it, in acknowledging that most of the Clergy were turned out before this Arming of the Countrey. Neither are the Papists in that Country so few as he alledgeth: Especially considering them as strengthened by all that owned King *James's* Interest, tho nominal Protestants. There was both necessity for Protestants providing Arms, and it was allowed by Authority, after the Prince of *Orange* Landed. That *One Troop carried all the Papists to Goal*, I know not: but I am sure, before the Prince and his Interest became formidable (which was the time when the People provided Arms) and while the Episcopalians were not discouraged from appearing for the Papists, many Troops would not have done it. The Persecution that he speaketh of was, by his own Confession, mostly (if he had said only it had been nothing amiss) Acted by the Cameronians: Which leaveth it on them, not on us, to answer for it, *page 8.* That all the Ministers of that Presbytery, except one who was absent, obeyed the Proclamation for Reading and Praying, is a bold Assertion. For it is said by guests: For first, They had few or none, to hear them, beside their own Families: Who then can witness that they obeyed the Proclamation, or before whom did they perform this Solemn Action? Secondly, It was witnessed before the Synod of *Wigtoun*, *April. 18. 1690.* That Mr. *Cameron* Minister at *Inch*, did the same day

day pray for King *James*, and the young Prince: And that he read not the Proclamation till after the Blessing, when the Congregation was a Dissolving. The Narrative, page 8,9. Of the *Two Commissioners treating with Patrick Paterfon to make him Provost if he would put out the Minister*, is most false: Mr. *Paterfon*, who is now Provost of that Town (1691) denieth that any of the Commissioners did ever insinuate any such terms of his being Provost: And these two Commissioners are known to be Persons of that integrity, that his Lies will not be able to stain them. They did no more than oversee the Election; which by the Convention was enjoined. What he maliciously saith of *William Torbran*, we have no more but his word for it: which of how much value it is, may be judged by what already hath been observed.

§ 4. The falshood and malice of what he affirmeth, about the *Commissioners from Stranrawer to the Convention, bringing from Edinburgh with them a part of the Collection for the Irish Protestants*, is so evident as nothing can be more. That Money was according to order, delivered to the Provost of the Town: Who distributed it Faithfully, to the Irish Protestants, who were there, according to their several Necessities. And the names of them who received it, with the place of their abode in *Ireland*, and what they received, was returned to Sir *Patrick Murray*: And these records can make it appear that it was not bestowed as he alledgeth. He cannot forbear to spit his Venome, even on the *Irish Protestants* (who had escaped the Bloody rage of the Papists) because they were not of his way: Which is a *Specimen* of his Temper and Inclination. He telleth a Story of one *Ferguson* a Souldier, who, with some others, discharged several Ministers to Preach: And inlargeth in some Circumstances, not worth our Transcribing; of the truth or falshood of this I have no Information: Nor what sort of man this *Ferguson* was: I easily believe (tho not on the Credit of this Author) that there might be a man capable to do such things: But are the Body of the Presbyterians Countable for every thing that a Person did, whom they know not, and whose Actions they approve not? The same is to be said concerning the *Irish Preacher*, mentioned page 10. Whom we know not, nor can we enquire into the truth of the Story, nor into the Circumstances of the Person: He not being named. For what followeth from page 11. to page 18. All the Information that I can find is that the incensed Rabble did indeed turn out these men, and discharged them to Preach: Which irregular practices we do no ways approve; but this is not imputeable to the Persbyterians, but to some who had suffered intolerable Injuries

ries from these Men, and whom oppression had driven out of the Limits of patience and soberness: Neither have we any ground to believe these aggravating Circumstances which he mentioneth, to be true; lying and misrepresentation being so Familiar to this Author. If the things mentioned be true, we disown and abhor them, as Barbarous Villanies. The Story about Mr. *Sommervel* at *Lefwals* being persecuted by the instigation of the Sheriff of the County, is disowned by Mr. *Sommervel* himself; and is incredible to every one who knoweth the Gentleman who is thus blamed. The account he gives of several in the Presbytery of *Stranrawer*, if all were true, is not strange (tho yet we are far from approving of what was done) for there it was that the most horrid Barbarities were practised on that poor People, by means of these Ministers; There one might see Bodies hanging on Trees by the way side: Heads, Arms, and Legs of the poor People who had been Murdered without due course of Law, set up on Poles, in many places: And is it strange that people should be enraged to see such sad spectacles of their Relations; or that disorderly passions, and from them, disorderly actions, should be the consequent of such moving Objects? But whether what is alledged be true, or not: I cannot tell, not having got information from that part of the Country.

§ 5. He concludeth his particular Instances of this Persecution page 18. With the account of Mr. *Ramsays* sufferings who was Minister at *Stranrawer*. Two things he complaineth of: The first is, that Mr. *Miller* the Presbyterian Minister there, Hounded out the Rabble to Trouble, and expel Mr. *Ramsay*, that himself might get the Tithe Herrings. This is denied as an impudent Forgery. And Mr. *Miller*, challengeth Mr. *Ramsay* or any else to adduce one credible Person, who will Affirm that he had any hand, directly, or indirectly, in the trouble that Mr. *Ramsay* met with, The second is Mr. *Maxwel* (who had been in Ireland some time) when he returned home, Mr. *Ramsay* also and others, could not get their Stipend. Tea the Sheriff incouraged all those to whom they owed any thing to sue them. Whereas he refused to hear them when they sued for their by past Stipends: By which means they were Starved out of the Country. Ans. It was little wonder that they had no Stipend payed them, when they did not serve the Cures: Nor that the Sheriff did not Favour them in their suing for these Stipends; for the Council had by a Proclamation appointed that no Decrees should pass, about these Stipends till the Parliament (which soon after was to sit) should determine in that extraordinary case. That the Sheriff did excite any to sue these Ministers,

ters, is said without any shew of proof: Nor can the Assertion of a Person who hath written so many Lies in a few pages, induce any rational Person to believe it, *page 19, 20.* He offereth to prove all that he hath said, and more, that he might alledge: Which we challenge him to do, as he would not bear the Infamy of that Lying and Slandering that he most unjustly chargeth the Presbyterians with, *page 20.* He classeth the persecuted Clergy, into four Ranks: The three former I have taken notice of, in answer to the two Pamphlets above answered. Of the fourth, which is, such as were put out by the Judicatories of the Church (which this mocker calleth *the Holy Inquisition of the Presbyterian Preachers*) he giveth not one Instance. I deny not but some (and they were but very few) were deposed, or suspended, by some Presbyteries, for insufficient causes: And it is no wonder that some Ministers who were not well experienced in the practical part of Church Government, might commit some mistakes: But this can no ways be charged on the Presbyterians, nor only because they were but very few that did so; but especially because the Church of *Scotland* took special care, both to prevent this practice and to redress the grievances of such as made complaint, after they had been thus wrong'd. For in 1689. a general Meeting did enjoin all the Presbyteries to be careful that none of the late Conformists be censured except for Insufficiency, Scandal, Error, or supine Negligence in the Ministerial Work; nor unless these were sufficiently proved against them; and that if there should be any doubt, either about the relevancy of what should be Libelled against any of them, or about the clearness of the proof of what any of them should be charged with in that case, they should not proceed to a sentence, but refer the matter to the General Assembly, which was to meet. This was what could be done by way of precaution. And for relief of such as pretended to be grieved; whereas such as were Censured by Presbyteries (most of them I mean, for some were so guilty in their own Eyes, and to the conviction of all that knew them; that they acquiesced in their Sentence) did appeal to the General Assembly, the Assembly (not having time to do it) did appoint a Commission of the gravest, and most experienced, of their number, consisting of 40 Ministers and 20 Ruling Elders, to examine these processes, and to take off such Sentences as they should find unduely passed against any Person. The Commission hath examined some of these complaints, and are going on with the rest; and have Actually taken off the Sentences of some: Such as Mr. *Spotswood* of *Aborfsule*: Mr. *Lyon* of *Kinghorn*: And Mr.

Bowis of *Abbotshall*: Wherefore we are not afraid of the Printed Account that he saith is coming out, (we have as yet heard no more of it) of such as were censured by the Church: But are willing that the World should know the whole truth of that matter.

§ 6. He telleth us, *page 21.* What Mr. *Douglas* Minister at *Skirling*, suffered: In which we are little concerned; For himself saith that it was the *Cameronians* that gave him this trouble: only I take notice of his false and malicious surmising, *That they lay in wait to Murder him:* And of his wicked Insinuation of *Murders and Slaughters committed by that Hellish Crew.* All the Nation know that the work of that irregularly zealous party was to deprive those Ministers who had been their cruel Persecutors from their Churches, and that none of them were ever Murdered by them. Let him bring Instances, and the full proof that he promiseth, for what he most impudently obtrudeth on Peoples Credulity, and he shall have an Answer. Not only the men whom he accuseth may be thus Vindicated in general, but the whole of the Story about Mr. *Douglas* is a Forgery: I can shew (attested by the Subscriptions of eighteen Creditable persons of the Parish of *Skirling* with the Bailie of the Town) a true account of Mr. *Douglas's* Case, which he and his Party may be ashamed of: It is to this effect: Never any of the Dissenters molested him, or gave him the least cause of fear: All that could be so constructed, even by the most melancholy Fancy, was; two Men, as they went by his door, stepped in, and asked his Wife, if she had any Monuments of Idolatry, and so went away. Never any of his Parish did either do, or threaten any hurt to him. The true cause of his flying into *England* was, he had run into so much Debt as he was not safe in the Nation from Captions; he had lived Intemperately, and Riotously: his Bible was laid in pledge for Ale; which lyeth yet unredeemed. His other Books were pledged in *Biggar* for Banquetting; his Wifes Bible pledged for *Mutton*; which she redeemed before she removed: His Households Goods are under many Arrestments. When he went from *Skirling*, he borrowed a Cloak from a Neighbour, and in the way to *Edinburgh* left the Cloak in pledge for a Quart of Ale: his Parish (tho Dissenters) did often relieve his Wife in her Necessity, and what she got that way, she spent in Drinking with Souldiers and others. Let the Reader now judge whether that be a Persecution like the *French Dragooning*. Our Authors complaint that no Redress was given by the State, to them who complained, is above answered, particularly the Latter alledged by him, to have been written by a great Person to the Parish

rish of *Bogie*, which Letter was produced in the Council by the Duke of *Hamilton*, this, I say, is cleared *Self. 15*, Of the answer to *Account of the present Sufferings*. What follows *p. 23.* is a Vindication of the Episcopal Clergy from provoking the Presbyterians, or having any hand in their Persecution in the late Reigns: Where one may observe the man to be *perfricta fronte*: And that nothing, tho never so certainly, and manifestly false, can choak his Conscience. He saith, *The Clergy can desire them to give one instance where any Dissenter suffered death, or was any way injured, by the Information or Instigation of any Minister in Scotland.* The contrary of this is notorious to all who have lived in *Scotland* these years last by past; that all do admire the Impudence of this Assertion: Nothing was more common, than for the Clergy to be Inciters to, and Abettors of the Persecution: By Informing the Souldiers (who were commonly the Executors of the Law against Dissenters) and going along with them, and assisting them in destroying these poor Sufferers: If instances of this be required, many may be given: For a Taste take these few, Mr. *Ramsay* Minister at *Torboltoun*, Mr. *Edmiston* Minister at *Gargonnock*, Mr. *John Row* Minister at *Pursued* their Parishes, each of them; alledging their Houses were Robbed: The first, got three thousand Marks, the second 6000, the third 3000, from the Parishes *Respective*; tho it was after found, that *Highlanders* had Robbed the second; and they were Hanged for it: And that the third had not in his House the value of one thousand Marks. And no Evidence could be brought that any in these Parishes were Accessory to these Acts. To these I add a fourth; Mr. *Mackenzie* Minister at *Boyal*, above-mentioned, went to the Garrison of the Castle of *Dumbartoun*, and got Souldiers to go with him, and apprehended *Robert Nairn* in *Napierstoun* (the Souldiers affirmed that he procured their being sent:) This he did several times; so that the very day that the poor man died, they behoved to remove him to another House; where he died, and Mr. *Mackenzie* would not suffer him to be buried in the Church-yard, and caused cast out his Family: so that his Wife and ten Children were forced to Lodge several Weeks without doors in Frost and Snow. What he saith *page 24.* doth not derogate from what I have asserted, *viz.* He affirmeth, that *They were neither Judges nor Parties, nor Witnesses, nor Accusers*: It is true they did not ordinarily appear so publicly against them before Civil Courts: Yet did they more privately assist in Military Execution against them; and that most frequently: And gave Intelligence to Justices of Peace, and others who had

Power to Molest them. Nothing can be more false than to say, That *When they were commanded by Authority to give in the Names of Dissenters they generally declined it, till they were forced to it.* For every one knoweth, that there were but few who shunned it: Most of them did forwardly obey this Injunction. Tho I confess there were some whom no Laws, nor Threats of Men, could prevail with to do a thing so unbecoming the Character of a Minister of the Gospel; but these were very few. He doth also aver, *That no Dissenter suffered purely for Dissenting; but only in case of open Rebellion, or in the case of Murder: As for Killing the Archbishop of St. Andrews.* This also is a notorious and shameful falshood. Did not all the Presbyterian Ministers suffer Deprivation of their Churches and Benefices (which he and his Party make such outcry about when it is come to the turn of some of themselves) purely for Dissenting? Did they not suffer Banishment, some of them into Foreign Lands, others from their Dwellings, that they might not be within fix Miles of their Parishes, or a Cathedral. So as hardly they could find a place in the Nation where they could reside, without hazard from the Laws? Were not multitudes Fined, to the ruine of their Families, for not hearing their parish Ministers, or for Conventicles; and what is this but pure Dissenting? I hope it is neither open Rebellion, nor Murder. Was not the *Highland Host* (a Crew of *Savage Robbers*) sent into the *Western Countries* while the people were living in Peace: Who almost laid the Country desolate, and left no Sustenance for Man nor Beast? Were not many Pistolled, or Hanged, or Drowned, as they were found on the Highway, or about their Work, in their Houses, or in the Fields, for no other Cause but they would not tell what were their Thoughts of the Insurrection at *Bothwell Bridge*; or of the Archbishops Murder, while they could not be Accused for neither: Or for not disowning the *Sanguhar Declaration* (when, may be, they knew not what it was) or for not disowning the Covenant? And can such people be charged either with open Rebellion, or Murder? What Jury could find them Guilty of these Crimes? Among multitudes of Instances of this kind that can be brought (for it can be made appear that above Seventy were thus Murdered in Cold Blood, and without any Legal Trial) I shall mention but three for a *Specimen*. Some Gentlemen (whose Names, out of respect to them, I forbear to mention) took two Women, *Margaret Laugland* and *Margaret Wilson*, the one of 60, the other of 20 years; and caused them to be tyed to a Stake, within the Sea mark, at *Wigtoun*, and left them there till the

the Tyde overflowed them, and drowned them: And this was done without any Legal Tryal 1685. An Officer of the Army caused shoot to death *Thomas Richard* of seventy years, at *Cumnock* in *Kyle*, without any Tryal, 1685. The same year, in *May*, *Graham* of *Claverhouse* (who after was Viscount of *Dundee*, whom our Author calleth, *The Great*,) took *John Brown* of *Priesthill*, in the Parish of *Mio kirk*, being at his Work in his own House, and shot him dead, in presence of his Wife, and that without any shadow of Tryal.

§ 7. He taketh occasion, page 23, 24. to mention several persons who are Murthered : As if all this had been done by Presbyterians : As the Archbishop of *St. Andrews* and others. But malice it self cannot charge these Crimes on that party ; some of which they generally lamented, because done by Men who took that Name to themselves : Tho' others of them were committed by Persons unknown, as the Murther of *Mr. Pearson* at *Carsfairn* : None in these parts can to this day tell who were the Actors in that Tragedy. Some of them by such as were in a declared state of War against the King, and all his Adherents, whose principles and practices we never approved ; and who were Enemies to the Sober Presbyterians, as well as to them whom they called Curates : Some also of these Murthers were committed on private pique, and for revenge of personal injuries done, or alledged to have been done. If it be true which he asserteth, page 25. That some of the Presbyterians since this late Revolution, have proved ungrateful to such of the Clergy, as had done them Kindnesses, when they were in Trouble, we are far from approving such practices : Neither do we deny that some persons are to be found amongst us, who are not so good as they should be. But that either the thing is true in the general, or that the instance that he bringeth is a Truth, we have little cause to believe on his Assertion. Nor do I think it worth the while to enquire into it. He saith, *He can confidently affirm, and is able to prove, That the Episcopal Clergy all the time* (I suppose he meaneth while Episcopacy staid in *Scotland*) *were the only persons persecuted, either in their Names, Goods, or Persons.* And all this because some who by their Severities were driven into Desperation, committed some Acts of Violence on some of them. But if he would prove this Assertion for his being confident to affirm it, it is but suitable to the whole strain of his Book, and tho' strange, is not rare. He must make it appear, that during the late Reigns, never any Presbyterian was called Fanatick, Rebel, Seditious, (even while they lived peaceably) that never any Minister was charged with preach-

ing

ing Rebellion and Sedition, who yet either spoke nothing of the Differences of the Times; or taught Loyalty and Obedience in all things Lawful, even to such Rulers as were of different principles from us. He must also demonstrate, that no Presbyterians were Fined to the Ruin of their Families, for peaceable Hearing the Word, in a House or in the Fields: Also he must shew that no Presbyterians were Imprisoned, Banished, or carried Captive, and Sold as Slaves, for not hearing Episcopal Ministers, or for Hearing Presbyterians; none of which he can prove: But we can make the contrary of all three evident; and should be at the pains to do it, but that the whole Nation are Witnesses to the Truth of all these.

§ 8. He cometh *page 26.* to a purpose (by what course he draweth it into his method, I know not) wherein there is some place for Argument: But I must the more easily dispatch it, because I have debated that point in my former *Vindication*; in answer to the ten Questions. It is, he pretendeth to take off the force of a Consideration that was in the Narrative of the Act of Parliament, whereby the Government of the Church was lately settled in the Hands of Presbyterians, *viz. That the Reformation of this Church from Popery was managed by Presbyters.* To this he seemeth to answer two things. 1. He denieth the Consequence. *Reply,* I know not that ever any did make this the Consequent; *Ergo,* The Government of this Church should be Presbyterian; for he may know that Presbyterians fix the Government of the Church on a surer, and immutable bottom, *viz. Divine Institution:* And do hold that whoever were the Reformers, the Church ought to be governed by the Presbyters Acting in a parity. Wherefore all his talk under this Head, is wide from the purpose. The true Design of mentioning Presbyters to have been our Reformers, is to shew that the Government of this Church hath been Presbyterian, even from the Infancy of Protestantism among us: They being Presbyters who settled the Protestant Church, and managed the Affairs of it, from the beginning, and ever till unfaithful and self-seeking Men, after a tract of time, got that way forcibly suppress, and Church Domination set up for some years. His enlargement on this his Answer is stuffed with Reproaches against the Reformation, and against the Presbyterians: I shall not rake into that Dunghil, for it smelleth rankly of a Temper not much inclined to the Reformation, and of an imbittered Mind. His Citation out of *Basilicon Doron*, I have clearly answered in the paper before-cited. His alledging

ledging that the Presbyterians engage Parents, when their Children are Baptized, to bring them up conform to the Covenant, is a gross falshood; it is not enjoined, nor by one of many hundreds practised, to mention the Covenant on such occasions. He speaketh of *Rules, and Prayers to purge England of Prelacy and Superstition, as used also at Baptism*, which I never was Witness to, nor heard that it was done by any in our Nation: But this Man pleaseth himself with whatever he can devise, to expose the Presbyterians. He cometh, in the end of page 27. To another answer to that which he fancieth to be our Argument for Presbytery, viz. To deny the Antecedent of it; or that *Scotland was Reformed by Presbyters*. Here the Gentleman giveth us a Specimen of his Argumentative Skill, which will not make any Man admire the Learning of his party, which they so much brag of, while their Champions do manage an Argument so fillily. He asketh, *Who Ordained these Presbyters? Whether Bishops or not?* Ans. It is an Impertinent Question: For if they were Ordained; the quality of the Ordainers maketh nothing to prove that they were no Presbyters, nor that the Reformation was not carried on by Presbyters. If the Design of his Question be, to prove that they were not Ordained, and so had no power to Reform the Church: I refer him for Answer, to the Learned *Claude's Historical Defence of the Reformation*. Who proveth that every Christian hath power to Reform himself; and that every Society of Christians hath power to Reform themselves, from all principles and ways that are contrary to the Word of God: And to set up Ordinances among themselves that Christ hath Instituted, see *part 2. c. 4. page 166. and part 4. cap. 1, 3, 4. The same is maintained by Calvin, Instit. lib. 4. c. 3. 4. Turrit. part 3. loc. 18. quest. 25.* But our present Debate needeth not that we should push this Opinion so far as these Learned Authors do. He asketh, *If they were not Ordained by Bishops, where are the Miracles that they have wrought to prove their Mission.* I shall not here alledge (as some have done, without being ever Answered by any of his party) that there were not wanting among our Reformers extraordinary Appearances of God with them, convincing the World of their being sent of him. I shall first take notice of the conclusion of this Argument (if it have any force) which will be, that our Reformation was unwarrantable, as being carried on, *A non habentibus potestatem*. And it is pleasant to observe, that this Author can brangle the Presbyterian Interest, by no other Arguments, than such as will, with equal force, shake our Reformation from Popery. 2. That Miracles are necessary

necessary to shew a Mans Mission, which is not communicated to him in the ordinary way, in respect of the Modes, and Circumstances, none do maintain but Papists, and such as in too many things Symbolize with them. *John Baptist*, and several of the Prophets, wrought no Miracles, and yet had an extraordinary Mission. It is only to be expected that they should work Miracles, who pretend to be extraordinarily sent, to preach a new Doctrine, or bring in a new Office into the Church which is not warranted in the Scripture. Next he will prove, *That if they were Ordained by Bishops, it cannot be called a pure Presbyterian Reformation*: His reason for this is strange, to drop from the Pen of a pretended Protestant. For (saith he) *I suppose, which none deny, they were obliged to preach the Gospel, as the Bishop who conferred Orders on them, bound them therunto*. Whither will bold Ignorance carry one? Can none deny this his Assertion? Do not all, except Papists, and a few Papizing Prelatists, deny it? If this were so, must we not condemn *Luther*, and all the Reformers, who preached the Gospel otherwife than the Popish Bishops, who conferred Orders on them, injoyed. The Inference that he subjoineth, is none of ours: We think our selves exempted from Episcopal Jurisdiction, and obliged to abolish that Order; not because the Gospel was at first preached by Presbyters; but because that Order hath no Foundation in the Word.

§ 9. A Goodly Argument he hath, page 28. That *Scotland* was not Reformed by Presbyters: viz. *Some Bishops Reformed; as Dr. Gordon of Galloway, and Adam Bishop of Orkney, he bringeth no proof for the former, but for the latter, he was Excommunicated for Marrying the Queen to the Earl of Bothwel; which had been incongruous, if he had not been of the Protestant Communion*. Answ. 1. That two who had been Bishops joyned in the Reformation, is but a small evidence that the Reformation was not managed by Presbyters, but by Bishops. 2. That the one of these complied with the Reformation, he barely asserteth, and his proof for the other is insufficient: Such things have been done; Protestants have Excommunicated Papists, as Papists daily Excommunicate Protestants: How congruous this is, I need not now debate. 3. If these Bishops had any hand in the Reformation, it is nothing to his purpose, unless he can prove that they exercised Episcopal Jurisdiction in the Protestant Church; which no History can Countenance; if they Acted as Church-men at all, they Acted as Presbyters, for it is certain, that in the beginning of our Reformation, none exercised

cised any Jurisdiction among the Reformed above that of Presbyter. He saith, *That where there had been Popish Bishops, there Protestant Bishops were appointed in their places, under the Name of Superintendents.* Here is a double mistake: One that the Superintendents were Bishops: Another that they were put into the Places and Revenues of the Popish Bishops. The falshood of both which, I have shewed in my *Former Vindication*, upon *Query 1. page 10.* That the Revenues of the Popish Bishops were settled on the Superintendents, is an Assertion that proveth, either that this Author is a Stranger to our History or that he regardeth not the truth or falshood of what he affirmeth. What followeth, *page 29.* Of the late bringing in of Presbytery into the Reformed Church of *Scotland*, I have fully disproved in the place last cited, *page 3.* After the most spiteful Venom spued out, that could lodge in a humane Breast, against the Presbyterian: which it is fit to despise rather than Answer) he concludeth his Letter, with an Assertion no less false than the rest of his Allegations are; *viz.* That his party suffer neither for Breach of Divine nor Humane Laws; but only for Episcopacy. If any honesty remain with him, it would oblige him to give some instance or proof, that the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, (for he ascribeth their sufferings to their opposition to the Fanatics of the Kirk) did ever trouble any of them, either for their Opinion about Church Government, or meerly for their compliance with Episcopacy, when it had the Law on its side; on the contrary, we can shew, to the conviction of all unbiassed Men, that such as have suffered by the State, did suffer for their Breach of the Law of the Nation, in not owning the King and Queen, as the Law required: And that such as were Censured by the Church (except two or three whose Sentences were taken off by Superior Judicatories of the Church) suffered for the Breach of Divine Laws, *viz.* For gross Immoralities: One Instance I shall give *Ex re presenti*; out of the Presbytery of *Stranrawer*, about which his whole Letter is Conversant: Mr. *Ramsay*, late Minister at *Stranrawer*, was by the Synod of *Wigtoun* put from his place, on these Grounds: Frequent Drunkenness on the Sabbath day, proved by the Oaths of *Baily Vause*, and *Andrew Mackennel*: Beating his Wife on the Sabbath, before he went to preach; sworn by *Andrew Mackennel* and *Robert Gordon*; the said *Robert Gordon's* Wife deposed, that she saw, at that time, Mrs. *Ramsay* Bleeding: Frequent Swearing; proved by the Oaths of *Provost Row*, *Baily Vause*, and *Robert Gordon*: I should not thus have exposed Men who once bare the

Character of Ministers; but the Impudent Accusations of this Scribler, and the obligation that lyeth on Persons and Churches to necessary self defence, do constrain me.

ANIMADVERSIONS

On a PAMPHLET, called,

*A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange,
in Relation to the Affairs of Scotland.*

HAVING proceeded thus far in contributing my poor Mite, for Vindicating the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, and meeting with this Print, of the same strain with these others above-answered; that is. full of bitter and unreasonable invectives, against Presbyterian Government; I could not shun making some Observations on it, whereby Truth and Innocence may be vindicated, against Lies and Railing. The design of this Print is manifest to be, to dispose His Majesty to preserve Episcopacy in *Scotland*, and to hinder the Setling of Presbytery: And it is a real and effectual refutation, that our Wise and Gracious King hath not found such weight of reason in it, as to be moved by it, but hath acted quite contrary to the malicious Insinuations of this Author. This Paper is nothing short of the rest; for most gross Falsehoods, in matters of Fact, and most injurious Mis-representations of our Way and Principles. It is said to be done by two Persons of Quality. One Wit might, by a little labour, have brought forth a more perfect Birth. What is the Quality of the Author, or Authors, for worldly Dignity, I enquire not, but his, or their Moral Qualities may, by the Book, be seen. to be none of the best. We have, *First*, a parcel of False and Malicious History, as ever was written in so few Lines. Next some Counsels to his Highness. 3. He refuteth a Paper that he falsely calleth, *An Address from the Presbyterians to the Prince of Orange*: And then concludeth, as he began, with Lies and Railing.

§. 2. The first passage in his Historical Account, is a foul mistake. (to call it no worse) viz. That the rise of our Animosities, and
why

why they are Warmer here than in England, is, England was Reformed by the Royal Authority ; and therefore their Church was suited to the Monarchy : But Scotland was Reformed by Force and Violence, and some of the Reformers, coming from Geneva, and Switzerland, inspired many of their Converts with an Aversion to Monarchy. A Man who taketh Liberty to slander at this rate of Impudence, deserveth rather Chastisement, than an Answer. For, 1. With what Brow can he say that our Reformers were averse from Monarchy ; or that the Antimonarchical Principle did ever get much footing in Scotland, as we know it did in England ; for all their being Reformed by Royal Authority ? Did ever Scotland set up a Commonwealth, as England once did ? It is known what they Adventured and Suffered for the Monarchy, when England abjured it. And what yielding there was in Scotland to the Antimonarchical way, was by Force from England. And it is known to all who lived in those days, that the Presbyterians did cleave more firmly to their banished King, and prayed for him with more Constancy and Resolution, than that party did, who after appeared for Episcopacy.

2. That Scotland was Reformed by Force and Violence, is false, it was by the States of the Nation, and at last confirmed by King and Parliament. The chief difference, as to the Original of the two Reformatiōns, lay in this ; that in England, the King (whether from Light, or Interest I do not judge) begun a half Reformation : And Royal Authority enlightned the Minds of the people (I speak not of all, but of the Multitude) but in Scotland, Light from the Word of God did move, first the People, then the Great Ones, and they prevailed with the King at last, Zealously to own the Truth of God : Yea, and to defend it in Print.

3. That the Government of the Church of England was suited to the Monarchy (that is, as I suppose he meaneth, framed by a suitableness to the Monarchy, as the Standard of it) is not its commendation : For that is to make it a humane Contrivance, or worldly Policy, brought into the Church of Christ, over which he is the Head ; and which is to be governed by his Laws : Whereas the Government of the Church of Scotland was contrived by the Word of God, as the Standard of it ; yet was it as much suited to the Monarchy as that of England could be : That is, it gave, and giveth to the King, all that power in the State that our Laws gave him : And all that Authority over the Church that is due to any Man on Earth. The Abettors of it preach and practise as much Obedience and Subjection to Kings, as others do, and can vie in Loyalty,

ty, with their Accusers, as shall after be observed. 4. I do not understand how our present Animosities, about Church Government should depend on the one way being suited to the Monarchy, and the other not, (seeing this Author (as well as his opposites really are) doth highly pretend, to be not only for the Monarchy, but for the present Monarch King *William*. But either he hath a latent Meaning, which hath much Truth in it, or he hath hit on the Truth by guess, as *Cajaphas* did, viz. That our Animosities about Church Government arise mainly from the different Inclinations that are in the two parties toward the Monarchy, as now established in the Persons of our Gracious King *William* and Queen *Mary*. The strain, both of their Writings and Actings, make it evident that with him the Interest of King *James*, and that of Prelacy are linked together: And their Zeal for the one filleth them with Spite and Animosity against what is opposite to the other. And whoso considereth the strain of this Pamphlet, will find that the Zeal that this Scribler pretendeth to for King *William*, is expressed usually under the general Notion of the Monarchy; which may be understood of either of two Monarchies. What he saith, that, *Buchanan*, and others, wrote Books that were condemned for Treason, is no Argument: For that which by one party is condemned for Treason, by another party, when they have got the Ascendant, hath been absolved, as not guilty of that Crime. That the *Puritans* vexed King *James VI.* is no further true than that they could not yield to the endeavours of some evil Counsellors about him, for overturning the Setled Government of the Church; and encroaching on its Rights. It is true, *He at last got Episcopacy settled by the help of some, both in State and Church*, who were either none of the best Protestants, or had their worldly Designs in promoting that way; but still our Author owneth (on the matter) that the Word of God was not consulted in this weighty Concernment of the Church: But only his fancied *suitableness to the Monarchy, and Conformity to England*. The account he giveth of putting down Episcopacy afterwards, and setting up of Presbytery, is neither like a Christian, nor like a Historian: It is perfect railing, while, he calleth the *Nobles*, that had a hand in it, *Ambitious and Factionous*, the *Gentry Priest-ridden, and blind Zealots, the Preachers Enthusiasticks*. The War that he mentioneth, is by all Posterity to be lamented, but Men as able to discern as he, have laid the blame of it on Episcopal Tyranny and Usurpation, and their making many steps toward Popish Doctrine, as well as Discipline. He next giveth

giveth account of the Solemn League and Covenant entered into without the Royal Authority, calling Parliaments, &c. These things were done by the Body of the Nation, met in the most orderly representative that the time and case could permit: And I deny not, but that they were extraordinary Actings, not to consider now the Morality of them. But let this Gentleman freely tell us, whether his Episcopal party be capable of Courses parallel to these which he so exposeth: The Presbyterians under the conduct of the *Primores Regni*, arose against their King, in defence of their Religion and Laws; did not the Prelatick party the same, and on the same account? They were indeed all for Loyalty and Non-resistance, while the Royal Authority supported their greatness and power over their Brethren, but when seven of their Bishops were touched, it proved another case, like that in *Poyden*, if we be guilty in this, they are not the Men who should *cast the first Stone at us*. For Barbarities committed by the Presbyterians in these times, I know of none, but what are the necessary consequents of a War. But this Man and his Associates, have no other Dialect, whereby to express their dislike of the Actings of the opposite party. He accuseth them with a Bloody Mouth, of what hath been a thousand times refused as a horrid Lie, *That the Scots Presbyterians did perfidiously give up their King to the English, who Murdered him*: He was the King of the English, as well as theirs, and they could not withhold him from them: And gave him into their hands, on as good security, as could be, for his safety; and if others dealt perfidiously with him they are not to be blamed for it. He hath a hint, as if *Episcopacy had been settled by King Charles the Second, because the Presbyterians refused all conditions of peace and pardon: And for the Monarchies sake*. The former of these is a great untruth; they never refused peace nor pardon; but would gladly have imbraced both: Only they could not buy them at the rate of Perjury: Tho' they never refused to disown any Principles that were indeed Rebellious. Their *preaching up Rebellion in their Conventicles*, is false: They both preached and practised Loyalty: Only after many grievous and insupportable hardships, suffered for their Conscience, some few of them were prevailed upon by that Temptation, to vent some Principles that the more Sober and Intelligent were not satisfied with. *That punishing them who were taken in Rebellion is all the severity complained of*, is a Notorious Falshood, as all the Nation know, and I have above disproved it.

§ 3. From these so well laid Foundations, he proceedeth, p. 5. to give His Highness some Advices; if they may not more properly be called Directions. The first, *That the Prince being come to support our Laws, is in Honour bound to support Episcopacy, which is confirmed by twentyseven Parliaments.* This is Saucy enough: As if His Majesty had Acted against his Honour now that Episcopacy is not supported. That Episcopacy is confirmed by so many Parliaments, I much doubt: But am not at leisure to cast up the account. But if this Argument be good, Presbytery should be supported, as being confirmed by many Parliaments; and now by this Current Parliament: Besides its Authority from Scripture, which he doth not pretend to for Prelacy. His second Inference from his Historical Narrative (or rather Railing Accusation) is, *That Episcopacy is necessary for support of the Government: And that they oppose Scots Presbytery, only as it hath in it many horrid Principles.* Both these are denied, and cannot be proved, unless we take malicious railing for proof. His 3d. *That what the late Rulers did was done by Law: And that these Laws were made for preserving the Protestant Religion, Monarchy, Humane Society, and Self Defence.* It is an easie thing to make Sanguinary Laws. and then Murder and Destroy Mankind according to these Laws: But I have shewed in my former *Vindication*, in answer to Query 5. That they exceeded the bounds, even of their own Laws: In the Horrid Murthers that were, in cold Blood, committed by Souldiers, with allowance, on Persons living in peace. But that these Laws were made on such necessary grounds as he affirmeth, is an Assertion beyond what Jesuitical impudence it self, hath as yet arrived at: But I shall not wonder, if he should assert, that the world could not subsist, except Laws be made for extirpating out of it, all who own the Christian Religion. Cannot the Protestant Religion, Monarchy, &c. be safe unless People be forced to wound their Consciences by hearing men who had invaded the Pulpits of their Faithful Pastors? Unless Families be ruined who live in peace, and pray for their Rulers, who hear a Sermon in a Chamber, and not in the Church? He affirmeth also, under this head, that *we value our Church Government more than the Protestant Religion.* A most false Imputation: But he proveth it, by three notable Lies: One is, *That we complied with the Papists, upon getting an Indulgence.* We neither sought it, nor approved the Papists being Indulged, nor did we join with them in any thing: We indeed had our Meetings at the same time when they had theirs, and so had the Episcopal men. The other is, *the Church of Eng-*
land

land, and their Party, hazarded all rather than comply, I gladly would know, wherein did we comply, and they did not. They had the exercise of their Religion under the same Government with us. A third is, *We magnifie the dispensing power, which they opposed.* All this I have touched before. This Assertion is false and injurious: We never approved it, we made use of the Liberty granted, because it was our due: But never approved of the power that the Giver of it did acclaim. How they opposed it, may be judged by considering whether the Contrivers and Promoters of these courses, who were about the King, were Presbyterians or Prelatists.

§ 4. The fourth thing (he is now falling from his Inferences and Counsels to the King, to proofs of his Accusations against the Presbyterians) that *their Principles prove what he would say*: And their Principles he proveth in that *he is informed that many of them own, that Subjects may force their King to do justice; that they are his Judges, and may Dethrone him: that they approve of former Rebellions that the Monarch being forfeited, Kings have no more Power than the People will give them.* I observe first, That all the Grounds that he hath for these Accusations, is, *He hath heard it*, but from whom, or what cause his Informers had: to say so, we must not know. If this be a sufficient Ground to move a Prince against his People (as this man designeth) let any Judge. 2. That he, and they who have whispered this to him, do not impute those to the Presbyterians, as the Principles of the Party; but to many of them: And no body knoweth how many. It may be there are, or have been, some who call themselves Presbyterians, who hold these, or as bad things: But the Presbyterians did never approve of all that had gone from among them. 3. What he saith about forfeiting of the Monarchy (tho I do not meddle with things so far above me) hath obtained with the Church of *England*, as well as *Scotland*. And his quarrelling at this, hath a further tendency against the present Establishment, than may be he is willing that every one should observe. His fifth effort against us is, *He taketh notice of Peoples threatening Ministers* (he addeth also, *Magistrates, which I never heard of before*) and *thrusting them from their places.* This was the practice of the Rabble, in some places, I have in answer to the above mentioned Pamphlets, sufficiently vindicated the Presbyterians, both from abetting, and from approving of these practices: And therefore they ought not to be charged with them. In the sixth place he would perfwade the Prince, *that our numbers are not so great as theirs, this I have also above Discourfed,* but I shall a little consider his proofs:;
one.

one is, *27 Parliaments under four Kings, have condemned Presbytery.*
Ans. If that prove, that they were the greatest number, the like Argument will prove, that we are more numerous now: For the Parliament hath very unanimously condemned their way. Next he will prove it, because *they were always easily overcome in their Rebellions.* Sure it was not so in King Charles the I. time: And in King Charles the II. time it was not the Presbyterians, but a few of them, that appeared. He saith that *the reason why they appear more numerous here (at London, 1689) is they are all here:* That is manifestly false: neither all the Nobility, nor the Tenth man of the Gentry, beside the Vulgar, who are the greatest number, were then at London. His judging of their designs of being there, is his groundless Fancy; suggested by his hatred and ill will. His party (forsooth) are so modest that they trusted to the Law, the interest of the Monarchy, and his Highnesses just sense of things: But others thought that they trusted more to King James's Interest, and were more moved by their aversion from his Highness: Let the Reader judge whether of the two conjectures hath the more probable Foundation. He alledgeth, that *the Presbyterians have raised tumults to fright Honestmen.* This is denied, his party raised (or endeavoured it at least) more fearful Tumults. And hence he would move the Prince, *to send down Forces, under well Principled Officers.* That is, *Facobites:* But the Prince was wiser than to Listen to such Counsel.

§. 5. He next would represent us as *Persons who would submit to no Laws inconsistent with Presbytery; on the account of the Divine right of Presbytery, and our obligation to it by Oaths:* Whereas his Party are readier to comply with any thing that his Highness and a Parliament shall think fit, for the good of the Kingdom, and so pleadeth for a hearing before his Highness, or any to be named by Him. This last we shall never decline. On the former part of this Paragraph, I make a few Remarks. 1. If he mean that we cannot so submit to Laws inconsistent with Presbytery, as to give active Obedience to them, or that we should do what is inconsistent with it; he maketh a right conjecture: But it importeth no more than this, that we Act by a Principle, and are not so Unconscientious as to do what is contrary to our Sentiments; if other men glory either in their having no Principle, in the matter of Church Government, or that they can yield over the Belly of Conscience, to promote their Interest, or to gain the favour of Men; we think *such Glorifying is not good.* But if he mean that we cannot so submit to Laws contrary to Presbytery,

as to live quietly under them : To suffer patiently by them, when we cannot obey them. It is a manifest slander : For we gave sufficient proof of that, under the late Reigns : And if any were unquiet under their sufferings, the rest, who were the far greatest part, are not to be blamed. 2. Our Author, and his Party, have very generous Consciences, which it seemeth are influenced by no other Law but the King and Parliaments Opinion, that such a thing is for the good of the Monarchy and the Kingdom: Men of such Principles can easily save their Interest, what ever side be uppermost. 3. Seeing they pretend to so supple Consciences, I fain would know why they do not comply with Presbytery ; seeing now the King and Parliament have owned, and enacted it, as that which is for the good of the Monarchy, and the Kingdom. Here is a plain declaration, that those men can have no plea for a Toleration to be granted them, or any Exemption from the Government now by Law established ; for their Consciences cannot be straitned in this matter : And therefore there can be no Imaginable reason for a Toleration; But either Humour, or a design to carry on an Interest contrary to the present Establishment : which I hope our Rulers will consider. 4^{ly}. He argueth with his Highness, from *The aversion that England must have to unite with Scotland, if Presbytery be set up there*. To this I answer two things. 1st. If the interest of Religion have more weight with us than that of the State (as surely it will when that promise is fulfilled, that *the Mountain of the Lords house shall be set on the top of the Mountains*) this reason will be of no force : It is better that *England and Scotland* be two different Nations, yet living as Sisters, in concord; than that the Institutions of Christ should be thwarted, that they be made one. 2^{dly}. It may be thought strange, that *England* should refuse to unite with *Scotland* in their Civil concernment, because *Scotland* cannot yield to them in that which concerneth God, and their Consciences : may not two Nations trade together, and be Governed by the same Laws, and yet bear with one another as to their Church ways ? But he enforceth this his Argument, by two considerations; one is, *Episcopacy is acknowledged to be the best Bulwark against Popery*. I know this is the Fancy of some, who are Bigotted to that way, but on what ground, or who acknowledgeth this, beside themselves I know not. The other is, *Scotland is Sworn by the Covenant, to extirpate Episcopacy in England*. *Ans^w*. The Covenant obligeth to no such thing, unless *England* call them to their Assistance. The Covenant setteth Limits to mens Actings, by their Station : If *Scotland* should meddle with *Englands* Church

Government without their call, they should Act beyond their Station.

§ 6. He next p. 8. giveth a Testimony to the Moderation of some Presbyterians (which some of his party will not own; and the strain in the whole of his discourse seemeth to contradict) He is willing that they should have an Indulgence, but that they have prepared an address for the extinction of Prelacy: This we own: But his Inference is strange, viz. *Therefore they can be subject to no Law, and the Covenant, tho Illegal and Irreligious, must be their Rule.* This is strange Logick, from the Mouth of a Champion of that party which pretendeth to have monopolized learning to it self. If Prelacy be extirpated by a Law, and Presbytery be by Law established (as through the mercy of God now it is) cannot Presbyterians be subject to that Law? And I have already shewed, how we can be subject even to other Laws. It is also an unaccountable Inference, that the Covenant (which he most wickedly reproacheth) *must be the Rule, if Presbytery be settled:* He may know that Presbyterians have no other Rule in their Church Administrations, than the Scripture. And if any thing in the Covenant can be made appear contrary to that, they are ready to disown it. For what he saith of our Address, it shall be after considered. The last thing that he representeth to the Prince is, *That the difference betwixt the Episcopal men in Scotland, and the Presbyterians, is but small: They having neither Liturgy nor Ceremonies, more than the Presbyterians have.* We are not for widening the difference; but would bring it to as narrow a compass as may be. Yet we must not tell untruths (as this Author doth) to deceive them who know not our affairs; by representing Agreement, where really it is not. For the difference betwixt us and them is irreconcilable, without the yielding of one Party, while they are for the Jurisdiction of one Minister over the rest, and we are for a Parity among them. He saith, *Their Bishops are in the place of our Moderator; whom we have sometimes confessed may be constant.* Ans. This we cannot yield: Our Moderator hath no Jurisdiction, yea no Vote; unless where there is an equality. The Bishop hath a negative Vote. For our Moderator being constant, it is contrary to our practice, yea our Opinion is, that whatever Lawfulness be in it, it is so highly inexpedient, that we can never yield to it. He saith, *the Presbyters have a free Vote in the Bishops Election.* Nothing can be more false. Is not the Bishop named by the King? And was it ever allowed, that the Person whom the King had named should be passed by, and another chosen? where is then the freedom of Vote? He saith,

saith, *the Bishops Govern only by Presbyteries and Synods*: The contrary is known to every one: The Bishop taketh their Counsel when he pleaseth, not else. The grounds for complaint and separation from them (such as we made) I have above discoursed.

§ 7. He bringeth as a Foundation of most of his discourse against us, a Paper that he calleth *the Presbyterians Address from Scotland to the Prince of Orange*. On most passages of it he hath some quibbling observes, more like a Bouffoon than a Disputant. If the paper were ours, I should not think his reparties worthy of an answer: They are so purely, either trifling or railing: but the best of it is, he hath pickt up a paper, to which either he, or some Body else, hath given that Title: But it is none of ours, nor was it agreed to by the Presbyterians, or presented to his Highness. We did indeed present an Address, if he hath any thing to say against that, we shall consider the strength of what he shall say: But for this paper, it is not only not our Address, but hardly can two papers aiming at the same thing, and on the same subject, have less agreement in matter, or words, than it hath with our Address. What he saith to fix this paper on us, p. 23. Is a heap of lies: viz. *That this Address was agreed to and subscribed in our publick Meeting at Edinburgh: That bearing that the Prince had Communicated with the Church of England, we demurred sending of it.* Not one word of all this is true: These men have taught their tongues, and their pens too, to speak and write Lies. Whence this Paper came I cannot conjecture, unless it was drawn by some member of the Meeting, and presented to them, but not approved: For I know, that several Draughts were privately made, and out of them was that taken which was sent, and which we own. Upon this consideration, I shall wholly pass over all that he saith on that pretended Address, and suffer him to fight with his own shadow. Another most impudent untruth he asserteth also, p. 23. *that at London our Commissioners desired some Persons of Quality to subscribe our Address, and would not allow them to read it, till they should Sacredly promise to subscribe: and this, he saith, some of these Persons themselves told him.* We were so far from that, that we never refused a reading of it to any who desired it. Yea we gave it to be read by several Persons of quality of whose subscribing it we had no hope.

§ 8. He next giveth the Presbyterians a few good Words: *He would not be Cruel to them, but pity them as deluded. He shall have a meeting from us, in both these; He would allow them Indulgence, but yet he requireth, That they should let other Protestants live too:*

That they should yield to such Accommodation as the Learned Protestants abroad are not against: That they should not abhor the Communion and practices of the other Reformed Churches: That they think themselves not bound to Persecute those of the Church of England. We can easily yield to all these postulata, sano Sensu. For the 1st. We not only let other Protestants live; but the People we admit to our Communion in all Ordinances; the Ministers we suffer to Preach and enjoy their livings, where there are no personal Scandals to hinder it. Yea, such of the Ministers as will secure the Church Government, we admit to manage it with us, and to all Ministerial Communion. For the second, we know there are Learned Protestants abroad who are for toleration to Arminians, Socinians, and what not: We cannot be for such Accommodation: but we differ not from the Generality of the Churches, and Learned Men abroad, in this Matter. For the third, We do not abhor the Communion of any of the Churches abroad, in their Administrating the Ordinances of Christ: But we know that some Reformed Churches have practices that we cannot approve; and in these practices we can have no Communion with them. For the fourth, we look on our selves under no tie (nor Capacity neither) to persecute those of the Church of England: Nor do we persecute any of them: We leave them to stand or fall to their own Master. He now p. 26. cometh very magisterially, to require security from us, that we will not by our Sentences, counter-act the Decrees of the Supreme Civil Judicatories; and that we disclaim that absolute Supremacy, or Papacy, that the Kirk hath always claimed over Kings and Civil Power. *Ans.* Tho we owe no such subjection to this Author, as to give him Security in this: Yet when ever our Rulers shall demand it of us, we are willing to give all Security: And we disown any power to counteract the Decrees of our Rulers: And all Supremacy or Papacy over Kings, further than, that the Church, and every Minister in Her, hath a Ministerial power to declare the Laws of Christ (not to make new ones of their own) and that all men, High and Low, ought to submit to these Laws, and obey them: And whoever will not obey them, fall under the Displeasure of our great Lord and Master: Yet that we do not withdraw Subjection, nor due respect, nor obedience in all things Lawful, from these Rulers who do break the Laws of Christ: According to our *Confession of Faith*, Chap. 23. Sect. 4. For the instance he giveth of a sad difference that fell in between the King and the Church: It was in a time when the People, and their Representatives did also contend with the King: And that in a Bloody War:
And

And things run to an undue height, on all hands. The Presbyterians maintain no such Principle as he alledgeth, *of the Infalibility of the General Assembly*, as he saith, p. 29. Nor of a *Supremacy over Kings*. Charity will Bury what is past (but spite and malice endeavour to dig it out of its Grave, and present it in the most odious drefs) and every one should, for time to come, Labour to serve God in the Station that he hath set him in. *The outrages against his Party*, that he chargeth us with, cannot be made out, except what was done by the Rabble, in an *Interregnum*; and the Actors were none of our Communion. If he had mentioned in particular the Libels against the Government, which he blameth in General; we could have enquired into them, and told our thoughts of them. But I may adventure to say, that nothing ever came out from among us, that contained either so heavy, or so unjust complaints against the Government in the late Reigns, nor did so tend to raise the very Foundations of that settlement, as the multiplied Libels of his Party do by the Government which now is. What remains is so pure Railing, that it admitteth of no other answer, but to brand the whole of it with this motto, that *it is void of Truth and Honesty*. And to his hopes that he expresseth of the Worlds judging and the Princes Acting; we oppose our confidence of the contrary of both; and our Experience of the Latter to the Immortal Praise of the wisdom and goodness of our Gracious Monarch, whose heart God hath inclined to favour our righteous Cause.

*An Examination of the Historical Relation of the late
General Assembly, holden at Edinburgh, from
October, 16th to November 13th, 1690.*

SEveral wise men who have Read this Pamphlet, think that the most fit refutation of it were (as I said of another such piece) to write on the Margin of every page, *Lies and Calumnies*. It is manifestly so unanswerable to its Title, that no man can have a true Idea of that Venerable Assembly, by Reading this Pamphlet. The Author confesseth *that he was not Eye or Ear Witness to what passed, and all that he hath is at second Hand*: And that as it seemeth from such as neither understood what they pretend to give account of, nor had the Honesty to make a true and fair Relation of what was obvious to every mans Observation. For, tho he calleth them *discreet and intelligent*

imelligent Person, yet not only the horrid lies with which, by their report he abuseth the World, do Witness the contrary; but we do more than guess who they were, and know them to be very un-intelligent in Church affairs, what ever knowledge they may have in other things: And that they are Persons highly enraged against Presbyterians, because they imagine that some of them had a hand in their being deprived of lucrative places. Even the keeping of the door of the House where the Assembly sat, he mis-representeth. It was not to keep out *Conformists*; but to keep out others as well as them, that there might be room for the Members of the Assembly: And for all the care that could be used, there was a very great Croud constantly in the House. That ever any were thrust out of the House because they were *Conformists*, is more than I know: Neither did I ever hear such a Cry, as he mentioneth; tho I was daily there: Tho I confess it was not very fit to suffer them to be present, who, it might be rationally thought, came to mock, or to pick up what they might improve to our disadvantage. There were in the Assembly, very often, some Persons known to be Episcopal, who because of their quality, and discretion, were not only allowed to be present; but had all respect given them that could be expected. And some of them, of Eminent ability to judge of things, observing the reasonings of the Members, and actings of the Assembly, said, *If the Presbyterians went on at that rate, they would gain all Scotland to favour them.* And I am sure, that this was said by such as are incomparably beyond his discreet Persons, in every thing that is commendable. It is an assertion like to these of his gang, which he hath pag. 2. That the Presbyterians exalts the Authority of their Assemblies above that of King or Parliament. This is a broad Lie. What he saith to support it, of *Acts of Assemblies against Acts of Parliament*; I have answered in my former Vindication. He next accuseth us, that we desired an Assembly after the Parliament had settled our Government: That is, we are to blame, that we would think of ordering the Affairs of the House of God, seeing the Parliament had allowed us so to do. Is the Church of England to blame, because they desired a Convocation to which he maketh our Assembly parallel? We desired to meet for other ends than settling the Presbyterian Government: We know it was settled by Christ long before, as his institution, and that now it had the Civil Sanction by King and Parliament, for its settlement.

§ 2. Our Historian hath quickly forgot his work: for instead of telling us what the Assembly did, he giveth us account of what the Parliament

Parliament Acted: And p. 2, 3. He severely Latheth the Parliament, for setting the Government of the Church in the hands of the Presbyterians alone, and such as they should admit, This conduct I have elsewhere vindicated as most rational: And surely this was so necessary, that either Episcopacy must be continued, or this must be done: Now the Convention had voted Episcopacy to be a Grievance to the Nation, and in the *Claim of Right* made it a Fundamental Article in the Government, that it should be abolished: and the Presbyterians being the smaller number (many of them being removed by Death, through the course of about 30 years, and the hardships they endured through Episcopal fury; and few coming in their places, being hindered by a severe Persecution) it had been very incongruous, and inconsistent with the standing of the Government which they designed to establish, that the plurality of them who should Govern the Presbyterian Church, should be Episcopal. Yet it was allowed by the State, and determined by the Church, that as many of the Episcopal men as were qualified to be Ministers, and would submit, to concur with, and act nothing against Presbyterian Government, should be received into a share of the Government: And such as had Ministerial qualifications should enjoy their places and benefices, tho' they should not so far own Presbytery as hath been mentioned. What is then the injury that he complaineth of, done to the Episcopal Clergy? None of them are deprived of their places, yea none excluded from Ministerial Communion, but of their own choice; that they will not submit to terms so reasonable, and necessary. They would have thought us (in the former Reigns) very unreasonable, if we had been suffered to enjoy our Churches and Stipends, if we were not Drunkards or Swearers, &c. and yet complained of hard usage; or if we should have demanded a share in Governing the Episcopal Church, and yet would not submit to the Bishop. He saith, *the Publick Faith* (for even that must abide his severe censure) *promised them protection, upon their Submission to the Civil Government.* *Ans.* Can he say, That they are not protected in all their Civil Rights: But it was never promised, that whoever would submit to the Civil Government, should be put in Capacity to overturn the Church. To enjoy a place in the Ministry is no Civil Right. The Stipend is a Civil thing: but a mans Right to it depends upon his being in the Office, and having the Charge of such a People: But it was never dreamed that a man should be protected to continue a Minister, tho' he be Ignorant, Scandalous, Erroneous, or supinely Negligent. He (according to the Modesty of his Party, and

and their respect to Authority) saith, *Their Petition (viz. which was given in to the Parliament that they might have a share in the Church Government) was disdainfully rejected, and the Act continued as it was.* *Ans.* Their Petition was indeed rejected, on the grounds that I have mentioned; but without any shew of disdain, and with as much respect to them as was due.

§ 3. He cometh now, *page 3.* to reason the Case against the King and Parliament, because of their settling the Government of the Church in the Hands of Presbyterians. What is Argumentative in his Discourse I shall consider: Neglecting the railing that he intermixeth with it, such as, *A Presbyterian Tyranny is established: That they, the Presbyterians, Lord it over their Brethren, more than ever the Bishops did, or pretended to do: His Reasons, so far as I can pick them out of his loose Discourse; are first, instead of fourteen Bishops now sixty are set up; by which he intendeth, as I suppose, that the Government of the Church was now settled in so few Hands as sixty.* *Ans.* The falshood of this is manifest: The General Assembly consisted of an hundred and sixteen Ministers, and forty seven Ruling Elders; and they were but Delegates from the several Presbyteries, in which there were ordinarily a greater number that sent them, than they that were sent. Now the Government was not: (by the Act of Parliament) settled in the persons of Ministers only, but of Ruling Elders also: Many of whom are Noblemen, and Gentlemen of good Abilities: Neither can it be said, that they were set up as Bishops; or acted with their Lordly domination, as will appear from answering his following Objections. He next saith, *Presbyters were subject to them who were no more but Presbyters; which hath no President in the Catholick Church.* *Ans.* It is true, it is not presided in the Catholick Church, that one, or more Presbyters, should be subject to one who is no more but a Presbyter; which is not our Constitution nor practice: But it hath often been, that Presbyters in their single Capacity, were subject to them who were no more but Presbyters, acting jointly, in a Church Judicatory; and this is all that is now done. The Presbyterian Church doth not subject the Episcopall Church to them: Nor doth one Presbyter among us judge one Presbyter among them: But the Presbyterian Church combined, judgeth every single Presbyter in this National Church. And when he shall demonstrate the Absurdity of that, we shall yield to his Argument. Again, he argueth thus, *They who could not be denied to be lawful Ministers were excluded from any share in the Discipline and Government of the Church;* which

which is contrary to Presbyterian Principles. *Ans.* The Presbyterians never held a Principle, so universal as what he hinteth, about the privilege of Lawful Ministers to govern the Church: They never held that a Popish Minister should be a Ruler in the Protestant Church: And they deny not such to be lawful Ministers: They maintain, that though it belong to all Ministers generally, to have a share in the Government of the Church; yet there might be some Cases in which (*pro presenri Ecclesia Statu*) they may be restrained from that privilege: Tho' they are not to be restrained perpetually, nor in the settled State of the Church. The Presbyterian Church had long been born down, and almost exhausted; they are now, through the Mercy of God, restored; they find a great many Ministers in Charges, who may be useful in preaching the Gospel, but disposed to overturn the Government of the Church, if it should be put in their Hands; is it not rational, that they should suffer these to preach, for the Church needeth their help: And yet not suffer them to rule the Church, lest they overturn her Settlement? They refuse none of them who will secure the Government, and are otherwise qualified for the Ministry. Again, tho' we own them as lawful Ministers; yet we cannot own them as Ministers of the Presbyterian Church: They have a right to govern the Episcopal Church, to which they had betaken themselves, and left the Presbyterian Church (tho' their Bishops, even in it, did not allow them that privilege) yet that they have a right to rule the Presbyterian Church we deny. They and we agree in Doctrine, and therefore we may teach the Church together: But we disagree in Government, and therefore we cannot rule together. He saith, *That Presbyterians hold, that it is unlawful for a Minister to part with his Right of Governing.* *Ans.* But the Church may deny him the exercise of that privilege, if she find him inhabile for the exercise of it. He pleadeth also, *That we blamed Bishops that they took this Power generally to themselves.* *Ans.* We did so, because they excluded the rest; not on account of any special inhability, but as having no right to such a power, which we maintain to be in all Presbyters alike. If any say, that Ministerial power is *quid indivisum*, and the exercise of teaching cannot be allowed, where that of Ruling power is restrained: I answer, this is true with respect to the ordinary and settled State of the Church; but such an extraordinary case of necessity as this may warrant such a restraint for a time. But if this Argument hath any force, it proveth that neither Preaching nor Ruling should be allowed: and it commendeth the

moderation of the Presbyterian Church, which will allow them to serve the Lord as they can, when they cannot do it as they should.

§ 4. He proposeth (tho' not candidly) but doth not answer our Reasons for this conduct. One is, *We could not otherwise make our Government sure.* And is it not reasonable that that Government which Christ hath settled in his Church (as we think) and which the Authority of the Nation hath settled, should not be rendered unsafe, by putting it in the hands of the avowed Enemies thereof; when we could exclude them on such rational grounds as have been mentioned. Another Argument he maintaineth as ours, *The Episcopal Men deserved to be thus treated, for their Apostasie.* *Ans.* I know not who ever brought this Argument: We go not to the rigour of all the Censure, that that wrong step deserved; we would rather consider what the present state of the Church, and the promoting of Truth and Holiness, and Unity, doth require; than what Men deserve. We are for moderation, mangre all the reproaches that he, and such as he cast upon us: Tho' at the same time, we think that the Rigour of Church Discipline might put more force in this Argument than he is aware of. He inferreth from what he had discoursed, *That Presbyterians juggle with God and Man; because they hold their Government to be so of Divine Right, that they can make no composition with Men about it; but when it maketh for the Interest, they can make Essential Alterations.* *Ans.* We hold Parity to be of Divine Right, and cannot yield to Imparity: But this Parity is not taken away (as he alledgeth) by excluding them who have rendered themselves inhabile; more than it is taken away by suspending a Minister for any Immorality, or Negligence in his Work. Neither is there here any essential alteration in the Government, more than there is in that Case. Here is no Jugling, but fair and plain dealing. What he talketh of nine hundred Ministers excluded, is a mistake. We exclude none of them, but such as persist in their Principles, and Inclinations, to overturn the Government. *Neither is there Inconsistency (as he would make us believe) between making Ruling Power Essential to a Minister, and suspending the exercise of it for a time.* We hold, that Rationality is essential to a Man, tho' some Scriblers be now and then Delirious.

§ 5. From this digression, he returneth to his History, page 4. And giveth an account of the meeting of the Ministers and Elders, antecedent to the General Assembly, indicted by the King and Parliament, to be held October 16. 1690. In which Narrative, he doth in several things, mis-inform his Readers, and represent things

to the disadvantage of truth, and of the Presbyterians. It is a misrepresentation, *That the Act of Parliament Committed the Care and Management of the Government to these few surviving Presbyterian Ministers who had not complied with Episcopacy.* For it was to them, and the Elders, and such Ministers and Elders as they had received, or should receive. Another mistake is, *That the Meeting that preceded the forementioned Assembly was called, to lay down methods how a General Assembly should be called, and constituted, because one could not be had, according to their minds, after the old manner, and standing Rules of General Assemblies.* *Ans.* This Meeting was not called for that end, nor did act any thing to that purpose, nor needed they do so: For the Act of Parliament had excluded all the Episcopal Ministers from sitting in the General Assembly, unless they were taken in by the Presbyterians. All that they did, that could any way concern the Constitution of the Assembly, was, that Presbyteries should send three, or four of their number to the Assembly, where they had sent but two, when there were more Ministers in each Presbytery; which could no way alter the Constitution of the Assembly. He giveth a false account of the Act of Parliament, by which Presbyterian Government was settled; when he saith, *That by it none had a share of the Government, but such Ministers as had been removed by the restoration of Episcopacy.* For both Ruling Elders are expressly mentioned, and such Ministers as the Presbyterians had received, or should receive. Hence followeth another mistake; viz. *That they were over-seen when they admitted others into the Government, and were by that means over-voted.* None were admitted but such as the Act of Parliament reached; nor was there any over-voting in the Case; for both they who had been turned out by the Bishops, and they who were after taken in, did generally agree in the same Votes. He would revive the old forgotten, and Fatal Division, that rent and ruined this Church, about the *Protestation and Remonstrance*: But, through the Mercy of God, it is not so much as mentioned among us. That some of the Remonstrators, who had been, under that woful Schism in the Church, deposed by the opposite party; fate among us, is true; and we know no reason why it should not be so; for their Sentences were taken off, long before: And what was moved, and done in that meeting was, that the revoking of these Sentences should be now confirmed by this Meeting, as being of more extensive Authority than these which had recalled them. That any of them who sat there, were deposed for scandalous and gross Crimes: Or for any thing but their

Opinion in that controverted point, and their practice according to it; is more than we know, and unless he can make it appear, he ought to be reputed a Slanderer; if he or any else shall prove it, we shall acknowledge our Errour, at least our Ignorance, and shall rectifie what we have done amiss. What he saith of Mr. *Pitcairn's protesting against their sitting there*, is a gross mistake: That Reverend Brother was dissatisfied with the way of wording the Determination of the Meeting in that Affair, which some proposed; and was a little hot about it; but he was soon satisfied: Neither did he enter any Protestation; tho' he spoke of it: Nor did he object against the recalling of their Sentences. In all this our Author giveth his Readers a most false and unfair *Idea* of our Affairs.

§ 6. Which he doth yet more in what followeth, he telleth us of a *Debate betwixt the old and the young Men, which of the two should Rule*. A Controversie that never was so much as named in any of our meetings, nor for what I know in private Discourse. Nothing can be more false than the story that he telleth; for instance in this matter, of a *Contest between Mr. Rule and Mr. Webster*. No such words were ever spoken: And if they had, there had been no truth in them. For what he talketh (in his Marginal Note) of *the Contribution of the Sisters*, savoureth more of Spite than Wit. Some of the Nonconformists lived on their own Estates, others by their Industry in Lawful Callings, yet diligently preaching the Gospel, others by the Charity of good Women, and good Men too; as our Lord and his Apostles did: And his own party are now brought to that Mortification, that I suppose the *Contributions of the Sisters* are not despised by them. He quarrelleth with the Name of the *General Meeting* that preceded the Assembly, as being none of the Names of the Church Judicatories known since the Reformation. What if we should say, it was an extraordinary Meeting, such as that extraordinary Case of the Church did allow: And yet it wanted not Authority neither from God, it being made up of the Officers that Christ hath appointed to Rule his Church: Nor from Man, we have then a Liberty granted for the exercise of our Ministry, in all the parts of it. We may also defend it to be a *General Assembly* of this Presbyterian Church; which differed in nothing from that which followed, but that the one had the countenance of the King and Parliament; this other only that of the King directly, and of the Parliament indirectly: The Parliament having allowed the King a power of granting Indulgence to Dissenters from the Established way, as was noted on *Letter 2. Sect. 16*. In his

his account of the Work done by this meeting, he doth grossly prevaricate, while he saith, *They prescribed Rules for trying Episcopal Ministers.* They did indeed suppose that Presbyteries have an Intrinsic power of judging the Life and Doctrine of all the Ministers within their bounds, and of excluding the unfit, and receiving them that are qualified; but considering the present paucity of Presbyterian Ministers (which yet was not such as he would have us believe.) They were so far from directing them to try these men, that they did wisely caution them, and some way restrain them, in this Tryal: For their appointment was, that if, in trying these men, the Presbyteries should meet with any Libel the Relevancy of which was doubtful, or if the sufficiency of the proof were not clear; in such Cases they should not proceed to a Sentence, but refer the Case to the General Assembly; which was soon after to sit. What could they do more to prevent Injury to these Men; without denying that power of Presbyteries which is their due? He instanceth in some Presbyteries where were very few Ministers; we deny it not; but that was but in some few places, and at first: There are more now, even in these places, and in other parts of the Country there were even then a competent number in Presbyteries, and in some places few or none wanting: As in all the Presbyteries of the Synod of *Glasgow*. That there were so few, is not to be wondered at: The whole Nation being but t other day under Episcopacy: The Youth having been generally so bred; and the Presbyterians being almost worn out by a long tract of time, and heavy Persecution. There were fewer Protestant Ministers in the beginning of the Reformation from Popery, and yet it was not thought fit that either the Church should be without all Government, or that it should be put into the hands of Popish Priests while they continued such. He is also displeased with appointing greater Presbyteries to send more Ministers; as being an unequal Representation of the Church. Others will think that this was most equal: For the General Assembly is the Representative of the Presbyteries immediately (tho' more remotely they represent the whole Church.) And therefore where Presbyteries are unequal, their Representation should be so too. But by this means some part of the Nation were not at all represented. *Ans.* It could not be otherwise, where there were no Presbyterian Ministers; that place of the Church could not be represented by Episcopalians; for they neither had by Law, nor could claim in Reason, a share of the Presbyterian Government: Neither can this Argument derogate

Gate from the Authority of the General Assembly over the whole Church; more than the vacancy of a Parish can warrant them to plead exemption from the power of the Presbytery, because they have not a Minister to represent them in it.

7. The next fault that he findeth is, *The Meeting appointed a Fast on the Lords Day*; and saith, *That it was the Custom of the Old Presbyterians to appoint all their Fasts on the Lords Day*. This last is notoriously false. The reason why that Fast was on the Lords Day, it was the time of Harvest, when it could not be observed on a Week day, without high Inconveniency: Neither do we think Fasting inconsistent with the Nature of the Lords Day, Religious Joy and Religious Sorrow do very well agree. His story about the *Licensing the Treatise of Ruling Elders and Deacons*, is a gross Calumny; and hath several Lies in it. 1. The Licensing of that Book was not the deed of the Meeting, but of the Clerk, without their appointment or knowledge: And he also alledged, that the Printer added the words which imported a Monopoly of it. As soon as the Book came out, the Meeting were highly offended with the Clerk for this presumption; not only because he had done it in their Name, without their appointment; but because (as was said publickly in the Meeting, *Nemine Contradicente*) it belonged to the State to License Books, and to Monopolize the Printing of them. For this the Clerk was severely rebuked, and hardly escaped being deposed. 2. *That the Privy Council checks this, or called in the Books*, is false: For their Lordships understood that it was not the deed of the Meeting; and that the Meeting took care to get the License taken from the Copies, as soon as they understood it. Here then we have an Evidence, how gladly the Author would pick quarrels with us, and make us odious; tho' at the rate of telling lying Stories, which every one can contradict. He now beginneth, page 7. to give an Account of the Actions of the Presbyteries against the Prelatick Incumbents, between the General Meeting and the General Assembly, which sate in October 1690. He blameth them, *That they were more careful to Empty Churches, than to Fill them*. This is not true, they endeavoured both to purge out the Scandalous, and such as were like to do more Hurt than Good; and to plant the Churches with qualified Persons; and something was done both ways: Though we confess, planting Work went more slowly on than was wished; partly because of the paucity of qualified Men; but mainly through the opposition that some Men of this Authors Temper made, *Viz*

& *modis* to discourage people from Calling Ministers: And to perplex that Affair, when ever it was attempted. It is false, *That none were sent to the West, where there was most need: And that they rather seated themselves in Lothian, as being a better Countrey.* There is neither Truth nor Candour in this Assertion: Even *Galloway* (which therefore was most destitute, because the Incumbents had generally either been driven away, or deserted) is now tolerably supplied; tho' not so well as it should be, or as I hope in a little more time it may be. He giveth a false and malicious Cause, of the ejecting of Ministers in the end of page 8. *viz. They were conscious of their own Inabilities, and thought it not their Interest to tolerate such as accustomed the people to Sense and solid Discourses.* No other Answer is here fit, but to tell the Reader, That nothing but a fancy, tingured with Malice and Prejudice, can make one so compare them who were cast out, with them who were put in. His Stories of what this Man or t'other said, *when a reason was asked of their putting out of Ministers, and of their Preaching in Meeting Houses where Episcopal Men were in the Church.* These, I say, are not worth our notice. We will not defend what every private person saith in Discourse; yea, not what every particular Minister saith in the Pulpit, (tho' some Notes of Sermons he talketh of that I never heard of before, nor am at leisure to enquire about them.) We can give better Reasons for both these practices, *viz.* We put out Men, because they are Scandalous, and unfit to Edifie the People, and do rather harden them in Wickedness: And we Preached in Meeting Houses because many, often the most part, of the Parishes, would not hear the Prelatical Incumbents.

§ 8. There follows a whole Fardel of Lies and Malicious Representations, of the procedure of the Presbyteries: Few Lines in pages nine and ten that do not contain some Falshood or other; as, *That Presbyteries sent out Spies to observe Mens publick and private Discourses and Practices.* Let them give one instance of this, as the act of any one Presbytery: If any private person did make such enquiry, we know not, nor can we in all Cases condemn it: That they received Libels of old Crimes, is not so absurd as he would make us believe: If the Church have not been satisfied, nor the Scandal of them taken off. *That a Design was formed to disgrace the Clergy: That there was little or nothing made out against them;* are a couple of falshoods. The former no man can prove: The latter I have before disproved; and could give abundance of Instances. *That the Scandals of one, or a few was charged on the*
whole

whole party; is an impudent and false Assertion: He saith, That the least defects of Behaviour were heightened to gross Crimes: And what was no fault we made one by uncharitable Construction. Whether some private persons, who had more Zeal than Understanding, might not do so, I cannot tell: But he is now speaking of the Actings of the Judicatories; and that any of them did so, is false. That insignificant Articles were accumulated to a great height; Is also said, but cannot be proved. That some Ministers were charged with Admitting to the Office of Elders, or not Censuring Men of Immoral Conversations; Is not to be blamed: The Apostle giveth express Directions about the Qualifications that should be required of Elders: And it is certainly culpable to over-look Scandals in any, and more especially in Church Officers: That whatever was offered in a Libel, by any Bigot, was admitted: Is no further true, than that they considered it, but what was found to be irrelevant, (as many things were) was rejected: And no man was Censured for it. The Libels of Mr. Graham, and Mr. Cooper ought not to have been mentioned by him; for the one had never any effect; nor was the man Censured. The other is before the Commission, and the Sentence will be taken off, if it be found to be unjust. And I hope Presbyterians are not to be blamed, because some less Intelligent people do, sometimes, complain of men, where there is little Cause. It is next to ridiculous, that our Author (having no more that he can devise against us) blotterh Paper, with what was designed to be Libelled against some; when it was not done; And with some frivolous Accusations, that he saith, were made; when he cannot tell by whom, or against whom: I am weary of Transcribing these impertinent Recitals, of irrelevant Libels, that were not used by Judicatories, as the ground of Sentences: About which he spendeth also pag. 11, and part of 12. Besides what I have said, let it be considered, that some of the Processes on the Libels that he mentioneth, are yet depending and not discussed: As that of Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Wood: Others of them are discussed, and the Sentence revoked by the Commission of the General Assembly, as that of Mr. Bowes of Abots-hall.

§ 9. He taketh notice pag. 12. That in their Libels they would never give any of the Episcopal Clergy the Title of Minister; but only of Incumbent. If this be true (which I much doubt) it is but what they do to us, in all these Pamphlets that I have under consideration; and on all occasions: But I know no Presbyteri-
an

an Minister who denieth them to be Ministers: The Story that he telleth of what past between Mr. *Graham* and an unnamed person, I neither know nor do believe it to be true: And if any said so, we disown it. That the Ministers always had a hand in drawing the Libels: That they were all of the same strain, or that all was concerted among them to disgrace the Clergy; are Assertions as remote from Truth as any thing can be, if this were true, how came it that some Libels were wholly rejected, in others some things were judged not Relevant: If what he alledgeth was done, sometimes, by some one Minister, it is not chargeable on the Presbytery: Far less doth it follow, that it was always practised. He complaineth likewise of the manner of Processes against the Clergy: That seldom the Accuser was mentioned to the Accused: They always received the Libel, and sustained the Validity of it, before the Accused was heard; nor was he suffered to be present at the Examination of the Witnesses, and the Witnesses were all allowed to be present at the Examination of every one of them: And the most profess'd Enemies were received as Witnesses. *Ans.* For the former two, It is questionable whether these things be required in a Process about Scandal before an Ecclesiastick Judicatory; but whether it be so or not, I am sure it was otherwise done (for the most part) than he affirmeth. For the other two, it is so far from being always so as he saith, that if any Process was found to be so managed; and if Complaint was made, the Sentence was declared void and null; of which after. He bringeth two instances of such Irregular Proceedings, viz. Against Mr. *Heriot of Dalkeith*, whose Case is extant in Print: And an Answer to it daily expected (for it is now in the Press) to which I refer the Reader. And against Mr. *Purvell of Glencorse*, who accused the Witnesses of Malice, as having assaulted him in the Pulpit, and that they were admitted to give Evidence against him: And he mentioneth what Mr. *Selkirk* Minister at *Crichton* said, in Defence of that Conduct: This were certainly blame-worthy, if it were true, but indeed there is no truth in it, for neither did they ever pull him out of the Pulpit, nor take him by the Throat (as is alledged) only he having promised them to Preach no more among them, and yet attempting to falsify his Promise, they did, without such Violence, hinder him: Neither were such words, or words to that effect, spoken by Mr. *Selkirk*: And some of the Witnesses were rejected; and they who were admitted were purged from Malice, or partial Counsel, by their Solemn Oath. Another

ther mismanagement he mentioneth is, That if one part of the Deposition of the Witnesses seemed to prove the Libel, tho the other did exculpate the Minister, or extenuate his fault; the one part was marked, and the other not: And he telleth us of an Instance of this, in one who is since dead: But doth not tell who did so, nor against whom; and therefore not being able to enquire into it, we pass it as one of his many Forgeries. However such practices we disown, as far from our way. I am sure it was not so done, but the contrary, in any Judicatory where I have been a Member. He saith, *Accusing Witnesses were encouraged, and clearing Witnesses not noticed*: But giveth no Instances, wherefore I give the same reply to it, as to the former. He also accuseth us, That when a Sentence was read against a Minister at his own Church, the whole Libel was read, tho some Articles were frivolous, and others not proved. This also is but his Assertion, and no way proved. It is our way to read the Sentences, and to put no Article of the Libel in the Sentence. But such as are of weight to bear such a Sentence, and are sufficiently proved.

§ 10. After all this, I do not deny that some of the Presbyteries passed Sentence on some Incumbents, on slender grounds: but I have already shewed (*Ans. to the late letter, Sect. 5.*) That the Church did what they could to have prevented this: And I must now tell you that instances of this were very few: most of the sentences and proceedings will abide the most rigorous examination of unbiassed men, who have zeal against gross immoralities: And I must further inform the Reader, that where complaint hath been made, the General Assembly hath referred to their Commission, to examine such processes, and to take off all Sentences that were ill grounded; which the Commission hath done to three of them, which are all that have as yet come before them. Wherefore such proceedings are not to be imputed to the Presbyterians, but to some few among them, who through want of experience in Church Discipline, have mistaken, and are ready to learn more Skill and Warriness. P. 14. He giveth account of the carriage of the Episcopal Clergy towards the Presbyterians, who dealt with them as is above mentioned: But because he maketh no remarks on it, neither shall I. But what followeth I must not pass: It is a malicious reproach of Presbyterians as men of *Little Sense or Learning*. Tho he hath the impudence to assert this, when ever it shall be tried, he will be found unable to stand before their Arguments. And I am sure he hath given no proof of either Sense

Sense or Learning; in his Book; but many Demonstrations of Spite and Railing. He saith *they have lost their Interest in the Nation, are deserted: That men are ashamed of them, they are Dreaded as the plague of Mankind; What may be expected from a Tongue set on fire of Hell?* They are not so lookt on by any, but such as he is; whose kind respects to any man, were indeed a reproach to him: Or by a debauched crew, whom his faction indulged in their Immoralities; to which Presbyterial Discipline is a terrour. He saith p. 15. That the *most bigotted and bot-headed were chosen for the Assembly:* And instanceth in two learned men who were not chosen. But it was evident to all beholders, who were capable to judge, and even to the conviction of some of his own Party, who had not abandoned all Reason, and good Nature, (as this man hath done) That the Assembly was made up of many Grave, Learned, and Sober men: And their Actings will prove it in despight of his reproaches and obloquy against them. The two whom he mentioneth are learned and worthy men: But all could not be chosen: And I know some very fit Persons, out of an excess of Modesty, shunned it, and got others chosen. That it was concluded that Mr. George Campbel should be shuffled out of the Assembly, is an Assertion Demonstrative of a Brazen Forehead, in the Asserter: By whom was this concluded? Yea, or wished? For my part, I know them not: Nor never heard of any such motion. His going so near to be chosen Moderator (which this Pamphlet taketh notice of) sheweth, how acceptable he was to most of the Ministers: But there is a sort of men who should have good Memories; which our Author here wanted. His base Reflections on some others, that were chosen, do shew his own Character: viz. Irreconcilable spite against all that bear the name of Presbyterians. We could tell of hundreds of his party, for one of ours, guilty of gross immoralities: And even some who were in highest places in their Church; of whose repentance we have not heard much. But that we should not have mentioned, if it had not been in defence of the Interest that he setteth himself to disparage. Nothing can escape the Lash of this Authors virulent pen: P. 16. He most unmannerly taketh upon him to discourse of the Kings Choice of a Commissioner, to represent his Royal Person in the Assembly: And to tell who was the fittest Person. Where he taketh occasion to Calumniate the Earl of Crawford; by telling several gross Lies about his Lordship: As that he rejoiced in the expectation of being Commissioner: And shewed a grudge at the disappointment.

Such malapart abusing of any man, by judging his inward thoughts, (for I am sure nothing of that kind ever appeared in his Lordships words or behaviour, but much to the contrary) but especially, to deal so by so noble a Peer of the Nation, and who is so deservedly honoured by all good men; this I say, deserveth a more severe *Reprimand*, than my pen can give: His Lordship did what in him lay to shun that difficult Post: As also the Noble Lord on whom it was cast, was far from designing it. That the *Earl sat in the Assembly house* before he was a Member, doth not prove what is intended by it: For so did many others, both Noblemen, and of inferiour quality: Some out of Satisfaction they had to see the Church again settled on her ancient foundations; others out of Curiosity. That his Lordship *did officiously meddle in all the concerns of the Assemblies, before he was a Member*; is as remote from truth as *East* is from *West*. The contrary appeared in his Lordships often refusing to give advice when the Moderator desired it. That letters were written to procure a Commission to my Lord, is likewise false. It was voluntarily sent to him from the Town of *St. Andrews*: He being Lord Provost of that Corporation. We have a further false Imputation upon that Noble Earl. That *at the Visitation of the University at St. Andrews, he used the Masters Roughly, particularly refused to suffer Mr. Weems, Infirm through age, to lean on the step of a Stair.* *Ans.* That Noble Earl dealt no otherwise with such as appeared before the Commission, than did become his Character: His Lordship and the rest of the Commission, sat there by Authority of King and Parliament: And therefore disrespect to them could not but reflect on the Authority which they represented: When Mr. *Weems* complained that he could not stand, he was allowed to remove that he might refresh himself.

§ 11. He cometh now at last, p. 17. to his purpose, to give account of the Assembly: And beginneth with the Sermons that were Preached at the opening of it. He quarrelleth that *there were two Sermons*: Saying, *the Presbyterians can never have their fill of Preaching.* But the Reader may know that it hath been Customary in the Church of Scotland (and none but such mockers will reproach them for it) to make the first Day of the Assembly a Day of Fasting and Prayer; and two Sermons were no superfluity in that case. The Sermons he also findeth fault with *Mr. Cunningham's Sermon, that it was borrowed from Mr. Oliver Bowlis, being a Sermon that he Preached, Anno. 1643.* The reverend and worthy Mr. *Cunningham*, being now at his rest, cannot

not answer for himself; nor tell us what to say for him in this particular: But this I can say in general (and will be believed by all that knew him, and are capable to judge) that few Ministers of the Gospel did outstrip him in Ministerial Qualifications: And he needed be beholding to no Man for a Sermon. The other Sermon by Mr. Patrick Symson, he saith, *was course Presbyterian stuff*; but as Wise Men as he, thought it a Solid Pertinent, and Useful Discourse, to be preferred to hundreds of the Jingling, Py-bald Orations that many of his party do spend the short Glass with. What *Supremacy* or *Authority* he ascribed to the Assembly, our Author would fain tell us, but sheweth by his Expressions, that either his Ignorant Informers did not understand what was spoken. or he did not comprehend what they told him. What was said on that Head, I do not remember; but we ascribe no absolute power to the General Assembly: That their power is immediately from Christ; that is, that no Man giveth it, we own: He falleth p. 18. on the chusing of the Moderator. Where he taketh occasion to spit all his Venom against the four Ministers who were put on the List, out of which the Moderator was to be chosen: All this I might pass over; for my business is not to vindicate persons, but things: And all who have read thus far in his Book, will be convinced that his *Tongue is no slander*; and the credit of those Brethren is such as he will not be able to Ruine, by his Lies and Reproaches. Wherefore I shall touch this part of his Satyr but lightly. Mr. Campbell, he saith nothing against, and indeed his praise is in the Churches: And our Author had met with him before, page 15. And had told only of him, *That to please his Brethren he had been more severe against the Episcopal Clergy than was his Wont*. Nothing can be more false: He is no Man-pleaser, and he always had a true Zeal against that way, and against the Immoralities of some of them: And now sheweth no more of Zeal than is consistent with Wisdom and Moderation. Mr. Rule cometh next on the Stage, *He is called Doctor Rule, because he did practise Medicine*, and took the Degree of Doctor in it likewise, when he had no other way to maintain his Family; yet never giving over the Work of the Ministry; but preaching frequently. *He was once Independent*: That is absolutely false. At Aberdeen, he withstood the Temptation, when he had great Offers to take the Charge of an Independent Congregation: And in Northumberland (where he had his first Charge) he suffered no small Loss because he would not fall in with that way. His want of *Latine*,

and

and *speaking false Latine*, is false. He is ready, as he hath done, to give proof to the contrary, and to compete with this Pretender, when he will: For *His Prayers in Latine*; they are longer, or shorter, as the occasion requireth; but never so short as he alledgeth; neither doth he use to pray very long in publick, even in *English*. For the *Ignorance discovered in the things he hath written*; I wish this Sciolist would make it appear by a solid Refutation: The passage that he bringeth for instance, he is ready to defend, with all the probability the subject Matter is capable of. And if it were a mistake, it is no proof of Ignorance, to have a different Notion about a passage in an Author, from them who follow, as they lead, who have gone before them. If this *Momus* will make his Censure on the *True Representation of Presbyterian Government*, it is like Mr. Rule, or some for him, will give him a fair Answer. But lest all this be not enough to disparage him, and his Ministry, *He often venteth himself bitterly against the Episcopal Party*: Others think quite contrary, few Presbyterians do more seldom mention them, and an Argumentative way, rather than bitterness, is his strain. If it can be made appear that he hath done otherwise, none shall blame him more than I shall do. The many particulars he is accused of, have obliged me to say more in his Vindication than I intended. In the next place he giveth a Character of Mr. Meldrum. He spendeth a great many words about him: But the whole matter is in short, *That once he complied with Episcopacy, took the Oath of Canonical Obedience (which our Author is told, That he denyeth;)* *That going out for the Test, he left the Episcopal Party; because when the Test was taken away, he was not permitted to return to his Ministry at Aberdeen.* The Worth and Integrity of this Man is known to all in Scotland; and acknowledged by all, except them who prize no Man but for being like themselves. That he complied once, was a Token of Humane Infirmary: That he hath now left that way, is commendable; tho' it stir the Choler of this Scribler. His fourth Man is Mr. Kennedy, who was chosen Moderator. he is called Mr. Kennedy by his own party, and if any familiarly call him *Father Kennedy*, his Age may bear such a Designation; but they who call him *Bitter-Beard*, do mistake his Temper. *That he was with the Army at Newcastle, or received 6000 Marks*, is most false: He was never in England till 1690. when he was sent, with others to London, with an Address to the King. The Causes of his Deposition 1660. are foully mis-represented. It was only for his Opinion

nion in the matters that then divided the Church. That his Deposition was never taken off till the Penult day of the Assembly, is not the least of the Lies that this Paper is loaden with: It, with others, was taken off several years before, and this was ratified by the General Meeting some Months before the Assembly; and all that had been done in this matter was confirmed by the Assembly, a day before it was dissolved.

§ 12. The Moderator being chosen: He telleth of a *Competition for the Clerkship*: It may be, some of these persons, that he nameth, might be mentioned in private Discourses; but never any such competition appeared before the Assembly: And most of them were so far from either petition or competition, that they rather declined it when it was mentioned to them by their Friends. He accuseth the Assembly as *insufficient to represent the Church of Scotland, as that of Trent was to represent the Catholick Church*: But he cannot deny that it represented the *Presbyterian Church*; and was all that could be had of a *Presbyterian Assembly*: And we deny not that the Council of *Trent* represented the *Popish*, tho' not the *Catholick Christian Church*, as was pretended. And indeed there were some from all parts of the Nation, even from the Northern Counties of *Ross, Murray, Aberdeen*. That there wanted from one or two Counties, maketh nothing against the Authority of the Assembly: For there are places in the *Highlands* from which seldom or never there have been Commissioners at any Church Assembly. What Spirit ruled in this Assembly, he determineth, with the same malice that hath hitherto appeared in his Book; and mocketh at the *Prayers that were put up for another Spirit*. By this, and such like passages, it appeareth what Spirit acteth this Scribler. It is false, *That the Presbyterians in Scotland have always contested with their Kings about the Power of Calling Assemblies*. Their Kings never denied their *Intrinsic Power* in this, except when they were influenced by a *Prelatical, Erastian Crew* about them: But on the contrary have settled it by their Laws, as the Churches privilege: As in the Act 1592, which is ratified by an Act of this current Parliament; neither did they deny to the King a Power of Calling Assemblies, nor have ever refused to meet when called by him: We think it most desirable when the King and the Church agree about this; and it moveth this Mans spite, that Affairs were so managed in this Assembly. The ridiculous Expression in Prayer that he imputeth to Mr. *Cunningham*, calling it a pleasant passage, is a meer Forgery: That Reve-

Reverend and Wise Man, understood well what he said. He is not ashamed to tell Lies in the Face of the Sun, and to impose upon our Senses; when he not only denieth the Kings Letter and the Assemblies Answer to it to be published (both which are ex- tant in the printed Acts of the General Assembly) but he falsifieth the Kings Letter most palpably, in making the King say, *That he settled the Government, because it was agreeable to the Inclinations of the People.* Whereas it is, That Government which was judged to be so. And that *He would have them do nothing that might displease their Neighbour Church: Whereas the Letter saith, That Moderation is expected from them by their Neighbour Churches.* He maketh no Churches their Standard; far less the Church of England; who His Majesty well knew, were dissatisfied with the very Being of that Assembly; and with all that they could Act, in managing of Presbyterian Government. He doth also mis-represent the Assemblies Answer to His Majesties Letter; as affirming, *That their Government was not only agreeable to the Inclinations of the People, but most agreeable to the Word of God.* Whatever be our Opinion in that (which we neither deny nor: conceal) it is not so expressed: The words are, *We are persuaded that it is not more agreeable to the Inclinations and Conscientious Perswasions, of all within this Kingdom, who are best affected to Your Majesties Person and Government; than it is acceptable to God.* He talketh next of an Act designed, but never concluded, for asserting the Divine Right of Presbyterial Government: And that it was the Legal Government of this Church: I think indeed that all the Assembly did concur in this Sentiment, but some thought it fit to express it by an Act, and others thought is not expedient at this time; and it is like had regard to his Majesties satisfaction, to whom it might have been uneasy, in his present Circumstances. What harm was there in all this? *Præcepta positiva non obligant ad semper?* He saith, *It is clear from our Histories, That Presbytery was never settled but in Times of Rebellion: And that this is declared in a late Discourse:* But if he had pleased to read what is written on both sides, he might have seen the contrary cleared in a late Vindication, in Answer to that Discourse, what a Member said in Parliament, *That Presbytery was the only (or the best) Security against the Encroachments of Kings;* was much disrelished by all that heard it, and suspected to proceed from no good will to Presbyterian Government; nor are Presbyterians obliged to Answer for it: The Assembly did indeed promise Moderation

ration in their Answer to the Kings Letter : and nothing to the contrary was seen among them ; and we know His Majesty doth expect it from them ; Whatever malign Insinuations this Man use to the contrary.

§ 13. He cometh to give the account of the Sermons Preached in time of the Assembly, especially before my Lord Commissioner. And he is so ridiculous, as to take notice of the least word that escaped any in the Assembly : By which he sheweth both his Malice, and how little it hath to work upon ; when he must pick up such things to fill up his pages, as *that one moved, that some might be employed to preach in the Churches of Conformists in Edinburgh* : Which was not seconded by any in the Assembly. His General, account of Mr. Meldrum's Sermon cannot be answered : It was satisfying to Intelligent, and Serious, Unbiased Hearers, tho may be, not to prophane Mockers. What one *Hamilton* said, *of want of the Gospel for 38 Years* ; I never before heard of ; and look on it as invented by our Author, or some of his Informers. The rest of the Sermons (except these of Mr. *Carstairs*, and Mr. *Wylie* whose praises as eminent Preachers of the Gospel, their Bretheren do not envy) he Treateth with that Bitterness, Malice, and contempt, that is futeable to the Historical Talent of many of his party. If he had mentioned any evidences of, such faultiness in these Sermons, they should have been considered : But his Railing Declarations are to be despised. If the Debauchery of his party did not more tempt People to count all Religion a sham, than the Preaching of Presbyterians doth, it were well. His bitter taunting of the Prayers of the Servants of God (which is his work. p. 35.) Is neither like to bring Credit to Religion, nor to his Cause: Was it ever heard of before, among Christians, that when so weighty affairs were in hand, spending time in Prayer was fit to be ridiculed : If this be to be vile, we will be yet more vile : And will contemn what may be the sentiment about it, of such as he mentioneth. I am sure they whom he thus ridiculeth, minded nothing but to seek help of God to manage his work right ; and the Lord was pleased to help them to pray, and a return of their Prayers was not wanting. An unfavoury expression he mentioneth, to have been used in Prayer (p. 36.) Which I do not remember to have heard ; but it is not unusual for this Historian to Coyn, where he wanteth wherewith to reproach us. He blameth *The slow proceedings of the Assembly* : And if more haste had been made, he would certainly called it Rashness, and precipitation ! For he hath a mind to find Fault. He talketh of *differences among us which were smothered*. Was ever so many men met, where there was no different apprehensions of either the matters, or the way of managing them, or the wording of things ? and was it not prudence to compromise what might

tend to a difference? but let his malice prompt his Critical Skill to its utmost Capacity, I hope he cannot shew that we did not agree in what was material, or that we could not bear with one another in what was of less moment. Our receiving them who had broken the Unity of the Church, and were called *Cameronians*, he endeavoureth to turn to our reproach. It is true they gave in a Paper that we were not pleased with, to satisfy their own mistaking Consciences, and to quiet the People whom they had led aside: We were far from approving that Paper, but did expressly condemn it: And accepted them on another which they gave in, which contained nothing but their Submission to the Church, and their promise of endeavouring to preserve the Unity of it. Who can blame this? and is it not the exercise of that moderation which becometh the Gospel? But that *they were told, that they had done us good service, or that any insinuation was made of approving of their former way*, is among the rest of his false Representations which his Book is stuffed with. For what end he taketh notice of the competition about Mr. *Semple*, I know not: For here is no matter of reproach: Only he misrepresenteth the debate about allowing some Ministers to go to *Northumberland*, at the desire of the People there: Much more was said for it, than he mentioneth; and what was of more weight: And what he doth notice is falsely narrated: There was no mention made of *planting the Gospel in England*: He whom our Author imputeth this to, never thought that they of the Church of England had not the Gospel: Nor was it said *that between Berwick and Newcastle they wanted the word of God*; but, that the Presbyterians wanted the Ordinances of the Gospel; not being allowed to enjoy them with the Church, unless they would comply with humane Ceremonies in the Worship of God; which they could not do with a good Conscience. What was said of the *Practice of Piety in those parts*, I do not remember; I know there are not a few in that place of the Country, who may be in the Judgment of Charity, thought to fear the Lord: And there are also many, yea, a far greater number, of whom the Assertion he mentioneth is true. The truth is, this Author hath inured himself to the foulest Lies and Calumnies, that he can hardly speak or write Truth. A further instance of this is, p. 39. That when *before Voting it was desired that the Moderator might pray (not for drowning the Noise of the Assembly, but for direction from the Lord in a case that was doubtful and of moment to the Church)* Mr. *Kirtoun* should have said, *What needs all this fool praying?* Mr. *Kirtoun* useth not to speak of prayer with such contempt, and if he had so said, it had not past in the Assembly without a check, and indeed he is in this belied.

§ 14. The account he giveth of Mr. *Campbells transportation from Drumfries*

Drumfries, to be Minister at Edinburgh, and Professor of Divinity in the Colledge there, needeth little Animadversion, save that by giving so lame an account of the Debate about the *Inward Call*, he would represent us as having little knowledge in these things. The *Inward Call* was not said to consist in the things he mentioneth; but, in being qualified by a sufficiency of gifts for the Work, and in the inclination of the Mind to serve God in that Work; both which are from the Lord. It was said, that the Church was Judge of the former; and that when one had these qualifications, and also the Outward Call from the Church; if he pretended aversion, or want of the other part of the Inward Call; viz. Inclination, he must give some reason for that aversion: For the Lord useth not to work Inclinations, or Aversions in men, which are without reason: And of these Reasons the Church is also Judge: For the Spirit of the Prophets is subject to the Prophets. It will now appear, that either the Author, or his Informers did not understand what was spoken on this Subject: Or that they did prevaricate in representing it. About the Earl of Crawford's receiving a Commission from the Town of St. Andrews to represent them as Ruling Elder in the Assembly; I have said enough above to stop his mouth, and to reſel what he here saith; only he addeth, that Joy might be seen in my Lords Countenance when he received it; which none could perceive, except such as can fancy any thing that their ill-will suggesteth to them. For my Lords seeking time of Deliberation till Lammas, as Mr. Campbel had; it was not intended as what he sought with expectation, but as an expression of his wish; and of his dislike of allowing so much time to Mr. Campbel, to the great detriment of the Colledge; at which others also were dissatisfied, tho' they quietly acquiesced in the determination of the Assembly. For the Petition from Dundie, it was not said, They had not the Gospel; for they had one Minister. What is recorded of that passage is, that the Presbyterian Congregation in Dundie, made Application to the Assembly, complaining that they wanted two Ministers, and desiring that the Assembly would take care to supply those Vacancies. But that the Moderator, or any else, said, that there was no true Minister in Angus, is a falsehood, like most of his other Assertions: For none of us deny the Episcopal Ministers to be truly Ministers; tho' we think a Bishop alone should not Ordain. It is also false, that any such expression was used by the Assembly, as, offering the Gospel to the people of Angus: The words are, that they should go to Angus, and travel in the Work of the Gospel, in Vacant Churches, and where they should be called. This is far from supposing that the Gospel was not in that County; or that there were no Ministers there. It is of the same stamp, that he maketh the Moderator tell two young men, who had been preaching in Angus, and had ill reception

there; That as they had offered the Gospel to that people in the name of the General Meeting, so they should now offer it in the name of the Assembly. We offer the Gospel to all whom we preach to, in the name of Christ, and not in the name of men. Another Imputation of the same kind is, that the Moderator said, *We will plant Ministers in Dundie, whether the Town-Council will or not.* I do not remember that such words were spoken, or words to that effect: But if they were, what the Moderator saith, is not always the mind of the Assembly; but only when a thing is proposed, and assented to, either by Vote, or by Silence. He tells us, p. 34. Of Mr. William Spence, who conformed, but fell off from the Bishops, because denied an Augmentation of Stipend: He spread Papers against them; they deposed, and excommunicated him. This man was sent by the Assembly, to preach in Angus. *Ans.* That Mr. William Spence fell off from the Episcopal party on the account mentioned, is utterly false: But it is the way of these men, when any fall from their way, from conviction of Conscience (as many have done) to ascribe it to some other Cause: And it is but suitable to their temper, who know not what it is to concern their own Consciences in such matters. Their Deposing and Excommunicating him, was for his breaking off from their Communion, and his expressing his Reasons, and for speaking against some of their practices, which galled them: And therefore the General Meeting, Octob. 11. 1687. After exact search into the grounds of his Sentence, did find and declare it to be void: and this was ratified by the General Assembly, Nov. 12. 1690.

§ 15. He telleth us of a Letter from *Aberdeen*, Desiring Ministers to be sent to them, and complaining that the Gospel had not been preached among them for thirty years. And Mr. Meldrum heard this read in the Assembly, and did not Contradict it, which the Author heavily aggravateth. This is another Gross misrepresentation; like the former: Neither they who desired Ministers, nor they who sent them, did any way suppose that *Aberdeen* had not the Gospel, or Ministers; but that the Presbyterians there wanted a Minister, and desired to be supplied: Which was accordingly taken care of. That Mr. Meldrum was not sent to *Aberdeen*, was no neglect of him; the Church of Scotland intending him for other Work: For the City of *Edinburgh*, and Colledge of *Glasgow*, are Competitors for him, before the Commission of the Assembly. The former malevolent Representation he reneweth, p. 36. (in the second numbring; for from p. 33. to 40. the pages are twice numbred) viz. That some were sent to the North to offer the Gospel to the Northern Shires. The words are as the former, That they should travel in the Work of the Gospel in Vacant Churches, or where they should be called: So that it is an Impudent Assertion (which followeth) that *It was proposed, stated, voted, and determined,*

in these terms, that they should go and preach, and make offer of the Gospel. It seemeth this Author hath his Design, if for a little time he can persuade some in England of these things: Tho' he knoweth his Lies can be discovered by us who are Ear-witnesses; and that his Villany would come abroad at last. This he not only asserteth, but layeth weight on it, as *sufficient ground for separating from us, as persons who teach another Gospel*, p. 37. He pretendeth to give an account of the Assemblies dealing with them who had appealed to them from Presbyteries, as being injured by them: And here he cannot find matter of reproach in the Letter sent to the King, to satisfy His Majesty in this matter; but he mentioneth a draught of that Letter proposed, which was appointed to be amended: This is to pick Quarrels. A draught of a Letter so worded, as he saith, or of that importance, I do not remember of, but seeing he confesseth it did not please the Assembly, why should it be brought to their Reproach? It is a gross Lie, That they were referred back to the Presbyteries and Synods from which they had appealed, (that I confess had been absurd :) They were all referred to the Commission, except such as the Assembly discussed; and that of Mr. Heriot, which was referred to the Synod. In which Synod, when his Case was tryed, the Presbytery of Dalkeith, as a Party, was removed, although Mr. Heriot in his printed Paper hath the Impudence to deny that they were removed. That it was thought grievous to Presbyteries to question the Justice and Legality of their Proceedings, is also false; for then no Appeal could be received from them, nor any Process re-examined by a Superior Judicatory; which yet that was done. The Affair of Peebles (that he next mentioneth) is so far from being proof of their unwillingness to canvass the Actings of a Presbytery, that it is an evidence to the contrary; seeing they did take that business into consideration, and not having time to discuss it, did refer it to the Commission, who did so determine in it, as both parties did quietly submit. It is true, when it was brought into the Assembly, some moved that it might be first ripened in the Committee, which was readily complied with. Neither was there any contest about it between my Lord Commissioner and the Assembly; as he falsely insinuateth. The printed Information that he mentioneth, had a printed Answer by Mr. Vetch: They were both considered by the Assembly. There were a great many Heretors on both sides; it is true, none who were of the Duke of Queensbury's Quality; but his Grace had not his Residence in the Parish. The passage in Mr. Vetch's Answer, from which he thinketh he hath so much advantage, maketh nothing for his Design. For it was not said, That a Call from the greatest part of the Parish, could not be had to a Presbyterian Minister; But that a Call from all could not be had (tho' even so it was too general an Assertion, for many

many Parishes there are in *Scotland*, where Presbyterians are called without a dissenting Vote) and doth it hence follow, that the people are not generally for Presbytery; because in many Parishes (yea if it were in all Parishes) there are some of another mind; or because in some Parishes, most are against it: I do not intend to dip in that Affair; nor to consider the Merits of that Cause; but do refer the Reader to the Papers that are printed on both sides; only I affirm, that the General Assembly, nor their Commission, cannot be blamed in this matter, seeing both parties acquiesced in their Sentence. Mr. *Meldrum's* resolution (against *Obtruding himself on a people against their will*) is consonant to the Sentiments of his Brethren, and yet the Nation may enjoy Presbyterian Ministers: For there are many more places willing to receive them, than there are men to occupy such places. If there was a *Laick* (as he speaketh) *who either Lectured to the Neighbourhood*, or said, *That the people of God may sin, but the wicked must not sin*; we disown both his Usurpation, and his Doctrine. But the Truth of the matter of Fact we must take from him on trust; tho' it is like he hath either invented it, or it hath been told him, by no body knoweth who.

§ 16. That the *Assembly* was so puzzled, as he saith, *about the Appeals of 11th Episcopal Clergy*, is false: And the Comparison that he useth is Odious, and Malicious: They were no other way straitened about them, but that they wanted time to examine them all: And on that Account alone referred them to the Commission: *Some of them*, he confesseth, *they ventured upon*: And these he quarrelleth with. And, *First* he giveth account of the Case of Mr. *Mitchel* and Mr. *Lesk*: But not with that Candor that becometh. He misrepresenteth the Act of Parliament that gave rise to this debate, It was not to repossess such as were put out for not complying with Episcopacy alone; but such as were put out in, or since 1661. for Non-conformity, or not complying with the courses of the Time. All that the Assembly had to judge was, whether Mr. *Mitchel* was legal Minister at *Turriff* in 1661. And they found that clearly proved, whence it followed; that Mr. *Mitchel* by the Act of Parliament, had right now to return to his place, which had been possessed by Mr. *Lesk*: It was proved that Mr. *Mitchel* was legally settled in *Turriff*: That he was unjustly Deposed by the Presbytery about 1655. That this Sentence was taken off by the Synod of *Aberdeen*, in which the presbytery of *Turriff* is; and that in *July* 1661. he was Deposed by the Synod of *Aberdeen*, for Non-compliance with the Courses of that time. Whence they concluded, that he was Rightful Minister of *Turriff*, and the Act of Parliament allowing such as were put out in 1661. did allow him to return to *Turriff*. It is false, that *the Reasons of the Sentence were refused to be given him*,
Mr.

(Mr. Lesk) for he demanded an extract of the process, and Sentence, and the Clerk was appointed to give it. He complaineth that *That the Act of Parliament gave access to the Presbyterians who had been possessed of places, tho the Episcopal men had complied with the Civil Government*: And was it rational that they should possess the Rights of other Men, because they comply with the time? was not the same done in *England 1660*; If Mr. *Kirtoun* had used his privilege, in emptying his Church for a fitter person than it was possessed by, it was not against Law: *Mertoun* was his Charge till he was transported to *Edinburgh*. But the Truth is Mr. *Kirtoun* went not to *Mertoun*, till the Episcopal Minister had left it, as knowing he had no legal Right: And when Mr. *Kirtoun* went thither, and got right to the Stipend of a year and half: He gave the years Stipend to the Episcopal Minister, who had left the place; and the half year to the poor. Mr. *Sleerie's* Case cometh next, which is not truly narrated: It is false that he was deprived of his Church, for he was never orderly settled in it; neither in the Episcopal, nor the Presbyterian way: It is also false, That he was discharged the exercise of his Ministry: He may preach wherever he hath an orderly Call: Only he is discharged to exercise it at *Fawkirk*: and in the bounds of the Presbytery of *Lithgow*, unless he be allowed by the Presbytery: And indeed it is not allowed that any man should Preach within the bounds of any Presbytery, without their allowance: Mr. *Sleerie* acknowledged his Fault in continuing to Preach there, having no orderly Call, nor being permitted by the Presbytery; and declared (before the Sentence) his willingness to forbear Preaching there: And the Assembly, upon his desire represented his want to my Lord Commissioner, and the Earl of *Crawford*; and they promised to deal for some Relief to him, from the Council, For asking him about the Doxology, and whether he repented of his conformity. I do not remember it, I am sure it was not appointed by the Assembly to be done. The following process against Mr. *Forsyth*, our Author approveth, as the only justifiable Act of the Assembly. It is well they please him in one thing at least. Mr. *John Mackenzies* case he narrateth very unfairly; hardly any came to hear him: And he had no due Title to that charge, because his Edict (which even by the Episcopal way, should have been served at *Kirklistoun*) was served at St. *Andrews*; So that the people of *Kirklistoun* had no occasion either to object against him, or to consent to his being their Minister: And he seldom preaching to that Congregation, the Presbytery removed him from that Church, but did not take away his Ministry; he appealed to the Assembly, but did not prosecute the Appeal: Wherefore the Assembly could not shun confirming the Sentence of the Presbytery. What is said to have been spoken about the matter, by this and other persons, I

am not concerned to enquire, nor do I know, or believe to be true, what he confidently setteth down. As to what he saith of Mr. *Heriot*, I have above told why he was referred to the Synod: About Mr. *Wood*, he doth not tell the truth, he was neither referred to the Presbytery nor Synod; but to the Commission of the Assembly, who have taken his Case into consideration.

§ 17. His invective wit stoppeth very low, having little to work upon; when he taketh notice, that *among the Ministers who were to be called from abroad, as having Relation to this Church, one was mentioned who was dead, and another who was prisoner in Dunkirk*: As if every Member of the Assembly were obliged to know the History of every private person. That the Presbyterians set lights by Learning and Knowledge, and do often run it down: And that Zeal for the good Cause is the chief Qualification, and instead of these, is an Assertion so notoriously false, that nothing but Malice could prompt him to it. Our Intrants to the Ministry are able to vie Learning with the Episcopal Candidates, and are far before them. That *Brewers and Illiterate Trades-men are set up to be Ministers*, is false, and slanderous. I deny not but some who in the late Persecution were forced to follow other Employments for a livelihood, have now resumed their former Studies: But they are not admitted, without giving good proof of a Competency, at least, of knowledge in the Scriptures, and in the Controversies in Divinity. And the same fate hath befallen his own Party, that he reproacheth us with. Some of them now follow other Employments; particularly some are turned Brewers; as Mr. *Norman Mackenzie* late Minister at *Midealder*, and Mr. *George Henry* late Minister at *Corstorfine*, have set up a Brewery in the Suburbs of *Edinburgh*; which I mention not to reproach them (for it is commendable to follow a Lawful Calling rather than to be Idle, or to be chargeable to others) but to stop the mouth of this Reviler. The Instance he giveth of Mr. *Russel* in his Tryals, that he denied the Major of an *Enthymem*, that he desired the terms of the Minor of a Hypothetick Syllogism to be explained, which was, *Sed verum prius*: That the Presbytery said, that he wanted Learning, yet he had Grace; and upon that admitted him: Every word of this is false. Every Minister in that Presbytery is ready to witness the contrary: And I have what I affirm under the hand of one of them who was present at all his Tryals; whose understanding and veracity, none who knoweth him will question. Mr. *Russel* hath the Testimony, that he hath a measure of Learning which is no ways despicable: That he hath a very good gift of Preaching and Praying. His complaint, p. 48. *Of the Desolation of the Colledges, and the insufficiency of these who are placed in them*; is surely not from Knowledge, but from Malice, and a resolution

resolution to reproach; it is a Foolish contest, who are the more Learned: Till it can be put to the Tryal. Not only the esteem of knowing, and impartial men (neither of which properties this Author hath given proof of in his Book) and the *Judicia* of Learning that any have given, must carry it: To both which, men of our side can appeal, when they are compared with their Predecessors; whether in knowledge of Books in any part of good and useful Learning, or in Capableness to direct the Studies of the youth: Yea in Grammar and knowledge of any of the learned Languages: Tho' I think neither party hath much cause to brag of their Abilities: Except in comparison. It is a base Calumny, to call the *Presbyterian Spirit, Narrow, and an Enemy to Knowledge*; much more is it so, to Assert, that we count it impiety to call commonly received Principles into question: Or that we reckon a free and Rational inquiry into the Reasons of them to be Dangerous. It is the bent of our studies to search the Scripture, and to consult sound Reason, both that we may know what is Truth, and how it appeareth to be so. It is an Ignorant mistake, to say, that we count the *Cartesians* and other Systems of new Philosophy, to be gross and Damnable Heresie. there are among us who have opposed many of the old, commonly received, *Aristotelian* Principles, more early and, may be, with more strength of Reason, then such as he are capable to do. For the *Cartesian* System, he might know (but that his knowledge is so narrow as to be confined to his own Party) that there are *Presbyterian* Cartesians, as well as *Episcopal* Cartesians. For mine own part, I very much value many things in that Learned and Thinking Author; but I durst never swallow down all his Notions, as I see some men do. I averr and will maintain it; that some of them lead to Atheism, others to unhinge some of the Truths of the Gospel; others are without ground or reason, tho' they be of no dangerous Consequence. But his impertinency hath led me into this Digression. I wish he had told us who are Enemies to Mr. Gregory, whom we (as he doth) do esteem the Learned Professor of the *Mathematicks* in Edinburgh. They of Edinburgh are so far from being his Enemies, that they have adventured to keep him in his place, which some think to be against Law. Who they are that say, the *Mathematical Sciences* are useless, or dangerous; I know not: If I shall meet with any such, I will contradict him to his Face. It is another Calumny, that we slight the *Hebrew, and other Oriental Tongues*: We do highly prize them, and wish they were much more common than they are, both among his

party and ours. For *striking out Mr. Douglas*; the *Professor of them*: Himself and others can bear witness, that the Commission of Parliament for visitation of Colledges, did, with much reluctance, remove him from his place, and were earnest that he should have qualified himself. He knoweth also, that the Magistrates of *Edinburgh*, who are Patrons of the Colledge, have offered to readmit him to that Office, if he will qualify himself, as the Law requireth, and that some of the Masters of that Colledge, who are Presbyterian, have often, and earnestly dealt with him that he would not refuse the proffer that the City hath made to him, and that the place hath been now a year kept Vacant, and a door left open for him to return: So much do we value men of Learning. But Presbyterians have no dispensing power: And the Law is plain. The *Favourable aspect that the Jewish Synagogue casteth on Episcopacy*, we deny not: But it looketh as broadly toward a Papacy. That the *Trade of Books is fallen on the occasion of this Revolution*, is his groundless Fancy. For in *Edinburgh* there are of late more Booksellers than were before, but I am sure in 1661. and 1662. I have heard Booksellers sadly complain of it. The Books that he mentioneth as *The standard of Presbyterian Learning*, We do not despise: But it is known that there are no Books truly valuable, among his Party, but such as we use, and that diligently; when many who Brag of their Books are worse Employed. The Sermons of Presbyterians, he taketh some pains to disparage: The Sermons that were Printed here, were so appointed by Authority; and are able to endure the Censure of rational Men; not of railing Scriblers, who resolve to Censure, and to condemn all on that side, without Wit or Discretion, the *Collection of Sermon Notes* that he speaketh of, if it be of what was indeed spoken, and candidly represented; we fear it not (tho' neither his Party, nor ours, can answer for all that is spoken) if it be of the strain of this Pamphlet; that is, a heap of Lyes and Railing, We will despise it. *Mr. Clerks Sermon*, that he speaketh of, I have not Read: He is able to answer for himself: His speaking with contempt of *Mr. Gray's Sermons*, sheweth his skill in the things that concern the Actings of Grace in the Soul. Ye know of whom it is said, that they cannot discern the things of the Spirit of God.

§. 18. He had thus far digressed, wanting matter to fill up his History. He now returneth to the Assembly p. 51. A Debate about an *Act against private Administration of the Sacraments*, he representeth as he useth to do, that is, falsely and without Ingenuity.

nity. That the private Administration of Baptism was, by Mr. Rule, or any else, called Sorcery and Charming, is grossly false. He professeth he never said nor thought so, and I who heard all that he said on that Subject, heard no such Words; nor Words to that effect. But here is an Evidence of the Learning, and Judiciousness of this Pretender to Learning, or of his Wise Informers: May be, he might say, that many who were bent for private Baptism, are so ignorant, as to look on Baptism to have its effects *ex opere operato*, or as a Charm, and this is taken for saying, *that private Baptism is a Charm*. He doth falsely represent Mr. Kirtons Words: He did indeed plead against that Act, but his Discourse was neither so unpolished, nor so peremptory, as our Author maketh it. It is false, *that Baptism in the Country cannot be had but on Sundays*. A Minister may Baptize every day of the Week, if notice be given to the Congregation to meet for hearing the Word: If any Minister do refuse to Baptize a Week day, so as in no case he will do it, he hath no Countenance from this Act. I know not why a Minister may not call the Congregation together to hear the Word, on occasion of Baptism to be Administred: If few come, it is their own blame; and needs not hinder that Ordinance. We did not scruple to Baptize in private, when we, with all the Ordinances Administred by us, were driven into corners; but we always held that this Solemn Ordinance of God should be as publick as the other Ordinances are; it being a Seal of that Covenant, which is held forth by Preaching of the Gospel, we think it should not be done in a Corner, when the other is publickly dispensed. But I shall not now fully dispute this point: If any of our Opponents please to let us hear their Arguments against it, we shall consider them. The Story that he telleth; of a Child sent away from the Church unbaptized, because it was not brought to Church till about the close of the Sermon: This Story, I say, is not true, nothing is more ordinary with us, than that the Children come late, even when the Sermon is almost ended: Yea, some of us have Baptized Children whom we knew not of till the other Children were already Baptized: The Child that he speaketh of, was not presented to be Baptized, till after Prayer, and Psalms, and the Blessing; and the People were dismissed, and the Minister was gone out of the Pulpit. It is false, that the People are Displeased with this: It is but some of them, and these either the less Intelligent, or such as are inclined to the Episcopal way. That Mr. Kirtoun did Preach against the Superstition of the Ceremony,

emony (viz. of Baptism) is not only false, but so consistent with his way, and Principles, that it is a wonder that this Author could alledge such a thing; or be so forgetful of what Mr. Kiroun had said, as himself relateth it, but in the former page. The Assembly appointed a List of Acts to be drawn which were fit to be observed: And this Authors malevolent pen representeth this, as if *They durst not approve of some Acts, and yet would not censure them.* Whereas they intended no more, but that there being many Acts suited to the time when they were made, but might be inconvenient for this time: Others that were fit for our Circumstances, might be distinguished from these; and is not this a common practice in Parliaments, without having such malicious Reflections made on it. That *We receive all the Acts of Assemblies as if they were Scripture; and pay no less regard to them;* Is an Assertion as false as any thing can be said.

s. 19. He giveth account of the Commission of the General Assembly, pag. 53. but as he doth of other things; that is, without Truth or Honesty: About the manner of Election he prevaricateth; but it is not worth the while to examine these Circumstances: It is a gross untruth, that *They were to have full and supreme Power, to Act in all things that relate to the Church:* The contrary is evident from the Instructions given to them by the Assembly, which himself setteth down: For the seventh and eighth Articles of them are; 7ly, *That this Commission do not meddle in publick Affairs; or in any thing not expressed in their Commission: Which is hereby declared to be given them in Hunc finem only: And pro præsentis Ecclesiæ Statu.* 8ly. *They shall be answerable to, and censurable by the next General Assembly; and shall continue till November next: If there be no General Assembly before that time.* Is it not evident from this, That our Author either understandeth not the meaning of plain words; or that he is not careful to speak Truth? Their Moderation or Rigidity (which he very positively, and confidently determineth about) must be judged of by their Actings: I am sure the plurality of them are look'd upon as Men of very Moderate Principles! But no Presbyterian can be moderate in this mans Opinion. In the List of them he also mistaketh; for many were on both Commissions: Whereas he maketh the two to consist wholly of different persons; but that is not material. His account of the Debate about the Instructions to the Commission, I need not examine: What was concluded, is that which we are concerned

edin. His Account of the Instructions is most false and absurd. It is strange prevarication so to corrupt and falsify a Paper in the Transcribing of it. Take for example, the 2d Article (which he maketh the first) He hath it, *That they shall take into their Cognizance all References and Appeals, not discussed in the Assembly, and such matters as have been tabled before the Assembly.* Where he maketh two sorts of things to fall under their consideration: Whereas in the true Copy nothing but what is expressly referred to them is mentioned: It is thus, *To take into their Cognizance all References and Appeals, and other things, which being stated before this Assembly shall by them be specially referred to the said Commission, to determine the same.* The Debate that was in the Assembly about the sixth Article; about taking in the late Conformists to Ministerial Communion, he doth also Misrepresent; it is false that it was said, *That by these Instructions, Repentance for Conformity, is required as a Condition.* For that was debated in the Committee; and it was determined to be left out; because the worst of them would be readiest to profess Repentance: Which they who acted from a Principle could not do. He observeth from the Instructions, page 57. *That the Commission was mainly designed against the Episcopal Clergy.* I deny not that it was designed against such of them as were unqualified for the Ministry, to cast them out: And against such of them as were Enemies to the Established Church Government, to keep them from a Capacity to overturn it. But it was rather designed for them who fall not under these Characters, to take them in among us. That *Presbyterians had Malice against them, or such Designs to ruin them*, as he alledgeth, is evil surmising: And in this he judgeth of others by the temper of his own mind.

§. 20. He looketh on all the Facts appointed by Presbyterians as designed to ensnare the Episcopal Men; and saith, *that they Fasted for Strife and Debate.* Their Witness is on high, who knoweth that other Motives engaged them to Fast and Pray: Even such things as are of common concernment to all who have true Zeal for Religion. But this Gentleman, and others of his Stamp, did not use to keep Solemn Fasts for the concerns of the Gospel: Only sometimes they had Fasts with the respect to the Weather; or when there was like to be a bad Harvest; which we condemn not: But think there are greater things that should move us to such Duties. It seems he knoweth no other ground of Fasting, but either averting of some outward Judgment; or
some

some politick design. He mainly challengeth the Fast appointed by the Assembly, because in the causes of it, mention is made of Episcopacy; the setting up of which is complained of; on account that it was always grievous to this Nation, and that it was done without the Churches consent, and contrary to Acts of National Assemblies. As also, that a great decay of Piety was visible under it. This is all that was said of Episcopacy in these causes of the Fast. This Fast, he saith, *Episcopal Men could not observe, without looking on Episcopacy as unlawful: As the cause of much Impiety; as defection from God and his truth: Nor without blaming the Church of England, and other Protestant Churches; yea the Catholick Churches from the Apostles to Calvin's time.* Ans. 1st. What ever be our Sentiments about Episcopacy, nothing is here expressed that needeth to stumble them who think it a lawful Government in the Church; and there are some of that Principle, who will say as much as is here said. Nothing is here said of its unlawfulness, nothing of its influence on Impiety: But only of its observed unsuitableness to this Nation, and of ungodliness having been *de facto* its concomitant. 2. If any did conscientiously scruple the Observation of the Fast, on the grounds mentioned, I ask who of them have been Punished by the State, or Censured by the Church, for this omission: The Church thought fit to lay Peoples duty before them, yet using all lenity toward them who cannot see their duty. It was quite otherwise in former times, when his party had the Rule. 3. The setting up of Episcopacy was more sinful in this Nation, than it could be elsewhere, because of the Oath of God that the Nation is under against it: Not in later times only; but in the time of King James the 6th, who caused the whole Nation swear the *Shorter Confession of Faith* called also the *National Covenant*; where it is Abjured. 4. All this sheweth, that we do not meddle with the Church of England, in this matter; but keep within our own bounds: And therefore she hath no cause to be offended with us, more than we have to blame her, for setting up Episcopacy. 5. His big words of *other Protestant Churches, and the Catholick Church to Calvin's time*, are the Dialect of his Party: Whose confidence of Assertion, and strength of Argument, in this matter, bear no proportion: Which we are ready to try with him, when he pleaseth. The Councils Act for Observation of this Fast, he doth also most causelessly, and petulantly ridicule: What is more congruous than when the fear of God doth not perswade men to their Duty, that a civil Court should deal
with

with them by a civil Penalty? The contest about the *Printer to the Assembly* he cannot let pass; tho' he can get no advantage there against the Presbyterians: But that *they must have a Printer distinct from the Kings Printer*. It hath always been the Custom; and our Kings never disallowed it. We are far from contending with the King about it, nor do we plead a Divine Right for it. The Debate between the two Printers before the Council we are not concerned in. Only I observe his Malicious Lye, *That the Earl of Crawford maintained, that the King should yield to the Assembly*. His Lordship is far from so owning the Church, as to deny to the King any respect that is due.

§. 21. After Apology for the length (he should have rather excused the Dishonesty and Impertinency) of this Epistle; He ventureth yet upon two or three things. The 1st is, the Assemblies appointing an answer to be made to these Pamphlets of the opposite Party (which this Paper containeth) where he is much misinformed: Mr. Meldrum was never enjoyned this task: Mr. Pitcarne had it laid on him, but after many Months, it was not done: And so they laid it on another; Not on him with the Assistance of others; as this Author saith. That Mr. Meldrum justified the Rable in a Sermon, is so far from his Temper and Inclination, that none will Affirm it, but such an one as this Historian. He saith, *we will never prove any material Circumstance, in matter of Fact to be false*; I affirm and have made it appear that few, if any of them are true. His next particular is the most Notorious falshood that can be expressed by Tongue or Pen. viz. *That the taking off the Sentence of Deposition against some Ministers, especially Remonstrators was proposed, but laid aside in the General meeting, and now done in the end of the Assembly*. It was done in a meeting of the Brethren of the Synod of Lothian (for them within that bounds) and in the General Meeting for them, and all others in Scotland: And what the Assembly did was a Ratification of what had already been effectually done: What he alledged Mr. Gilbert Rule to have said, in the Assembly, on this head, is a wide mistake; he only pleaded, that the Act should not be so General, as to comprehend all who were censured in the times of these differences, because some might, at that time, be censured for uncontroverted Scandals (tho' he did not pretend to give Instances of any who were so Censured) but that the Act should only reach them who were Censured on account of the Differences, *Hinc inde*. That this revocation of these Sentences was not proposed

in any of their avowed meetings, till the general Meetings; is not strange, for indeed they had no avowed meetings before: Tho' we think their meetings might be avowed before God; but not so before his party, who were their cruel Persecutors. It was done, as is above expressed, and confirmed by the General Meeting: And *Ex abundanti*, Ratified by the Assembly. Whence it is evident that no derogation could be inferred thence, either from the Ministry of any who sat in the Assembly, or on the Assembly it self, as he malevolently suggesteth. His last particular is about the two Commissioners, whom the Assembly sent to the King: Where he hath some Malign Reflections, both on them who were not sent, and on them who were sent. That any were Jealous of Mr. *Carstairs*, is a base Calumny. His Integrity and Skill in the conduct of such Affairs, is known, and valued by all his Brethren who know him. It is as foul a Calumny that *they who were sent were gratified by it; or had designs of their own*, nothing but Malice could suggest such a thought; For what could they expect: Or what could they obtain by it? Had they Ambition (one of them being past 60.) to ride post to London in the beginning of December, they could expect no higher Post in the Church, than they now are in. He will Characterize them also: One of them he had before exposed as far as his Malice and VVit could invent: The other he can find nothing against; and therefore his spite prompteth him to reproach his reverend and worthy Father; whose praise is in the Gospel, whose name is precious in the Church, and is above the snarling of such a Curr: Nor one word of what he saith in that matter is true: And the contrary is declared by some of the Courtiers that attended the King when he went to visit Mr. *Blair*, when he was sick, and on his Bed. VVhen his Majesty came into the Room. they who were present told, that though they had been long about Court, they never heard a more Handsom Complement, then Mr. *Blair* gave unto the King; nor more becoming a Divine. A Chair was set at the Bed side, for the King, in which his Majesty sat down; after he had talked a little with Mr. *Blair*, his Majesty drew the Chair nearer while he sat on it; But that such words were spoken by Mr. *Blair*, as is alledged, is most false. I should not have stayed so much on this, but that the Reader may take notice, what a Spirit of Lying hath possessed this Phamphleteer; and what ill will he bears to the Living and to the Dead, who have born the name of Presbyterians. He is now at last come to the Dissolution of this Assembly: VVhere he would have it thought, that the Assembly

sembly did design to call another without the Kings Commissioner, who was sitting among them, which was never thought nor designed. As his Book is full of Lies and Slanders; so his Epilogue is an abridgment of them all; doth amass them in one; while he saith, *That no material Falshood can be charged upon him*: The Reader will easily judge of this assertion by what hath been said; of his *Ingenuity* also, and of his *hating to tell a Lie*. I leave what hath been said on both sides to the Candid Judgment of the Impartial Reader, and to his Judgment who is a God of truth, and hateth the Lying Lips; and do joyn with him in his concluding Prayer (as I could do with little that he hath hitherto said,) *That the Lord would pour out his Spirit on us* (and on the other party too,) *That our Land may have peace, that the Divisions of our Church may be healed, and our Confusions may be wholly removed, and Order and Government may continue among us.*

POSTSCRIPT.

AFTER these Sheets were Printed, some Informations were sent me, which could not be inserted in their proper places, and therefore are here subjoyned. Concerning Mr. Ferguson of Kilparick, (who is mentioned, *Case of Afflicted Clergy*, Sec. Sect. 12.) is no further true, than that five Men and six Women came to his House (being provoked by his continuing to Preach and Pray for King James after he had been discharged so to do by the people) and when he refused to come out to them, they beat him on the Head, and on the Legs, and tore his Cloaths: But the Blows were such, as one that was his Friend did testifie, that he was more feared than hurt by them: For his Wife, it is false that they beat her. Only one of them held her while they so dealt with her Husband as abovesaid. Whence it is evident, that tho' their practices are no way to be defended, yet they are grossly belyed by this Pamphleteer.

I have also further Instances of the Clergies accession to the Persecutions of the Presbyterians under the late Reigns (which is so impudently denied *Late Letter*, &c. Sect. 6.) As that Mr. Graham Minister at Lochmabane, Mr. Brown Minister at Drysdale, and Mr. Thompson Minister at Applegirth, used to stand by Graham of

Claverhouse (after Viscount of *Dundee*) while on the Bench to judge the persecuted Presbyterians for Noncompliance with the courses of that time; and whisper in his Ear, the effect of which was observed to be the greatest Severity against such as they were most displeased with on that account. Also, Mr. *Andrew Hamilton*, when a poor Man, with his numerous Family, having fled from his Dwelling, took shelter in another poor Mans House in *Middleby*, caused him to be cast out thence, so that he was forced to lodge by a Dyke-side with his Family, while two of his Children were sick of the Small Pox. Likewise Mr. *Vallance* Minister at *Johnstown*, having persecuted *Robert Dunwoody*, so as he was forced to flee to *England*; when he returned, would not suffer him to live in the Parish, unless he would go to Church; so he fled to *Appleby*, where Mr. *Thompson* would not let him stay, unless he would hear him Preach, and the Mans Wife being ready to bring forth her Child, the poor Man, against his Light, was forced to hear: This is attested under the mans own Hand. One who had time, and would be at pains to collect such Instances, might find thousands: But this is designed to be done by it self.

In Vindicating the Ministers whom he reproacheth in the *History of the General Assembly*; I designed Brevity, especially not finding that what was laid to their Charge was of much moment; and that malice was obvious and observable to every unbiassed Reader, in all that he saith of them: Only the things that he saith against Mr. *Meldrum*, are of more weight; but that Reverend Brother being at a great distance, I had not opportunity to be informed of the Truth of matter of Fact: But he having heard he was Reproached, sent me the following Vindication; which I give you in his own Words, which are sufficient to shew what a Lying Spirit doth possess the men with whom we have to do.

Reverend

Reverend and Dear Brother,

SOME Months are past, since I heard of a Pamphlet published on design to expose our late General Assembly to contempt; for which end, I am told, the Author of it doth impudently misrepresent the Actings thereof, and injuriously reflect on diverse of the Members of it, among the rest, they say he bedaubeth me; I have diligently sought for a sight of it, but hitherto could not obtain it, *nec prece, nec pretio*. It seemeth these Men resolve (though you told them of it before) to hold on their way, of spreading these reflective Pamphlets in *England*, keeping them as secret as they can here in *Scotland*. where the falshood of the matters of Fact are known, and they might soon have their shame and lying discovered; but they know that bold calumniating, especially where there is no contradiction; nor knowledge of the contrary will make some blot cleave to a Mans Fame.

I was glad to hear you intended to give a just reproof to the Author of that Pamphlet, and an Answer to the Calumnies contained in it. And a Friend having (when he could not obtain for me the use of the Book) transcribed, and sent to me some part of it relating to me, I judg'd it duty to offer to you my Animadversions thereon, which, if it come not too late, you may cause to publish: This I do not so much for my own Vindication, as for the Truth and Churches sake, which he endeavoureth to wrong and wound through my Sides.

I profess I do freely forgive him any personal Injury done to me, and in some Conformity to my Saviour, *Luke 23. 34. Pray Father, forgive him, for he knoweth not what he doth.* Yet I think I can not be blamed if in Obedience to the Apostolical precept. *Tir. 1. 13. I rebuke him sharply*, seeing he is so guilty of the first part of the Character given to the *Cretians* there, *Verse 12.* For I do ingenuously declare that Narrative concerning me is full of Lies, and where he toucheth at Truth, he so disguiseth it, that it appeareth a quite other thing than it was.

I find no less than ten or eleven Lies in a few Lines, for he Asserts;

1. That I with Mr. *Meinzie* did at *St. Andrews* upon a Conference with the Bishop of that See, subscribe the Oath of Canonical Obedience.

2. That the Bishop of *St. Andrews* did by a Letter under his hand, assure the Bishop of *Aberdeen* of this.

3. That Mr. *Meldrum* himself was the Bearer of it.

4. That Dr. *Keith* did make Intimation of our aforesaid Subscriptions in the Old Church of New *Aberdeen*.

5. That we our selves were present.

6. That I so far deserted the Principles of the Covenant and Scottish Presbyterians, that I did Swear and Subscribed the Declaration when I was admitted Rector of the *Mareschal* Colledge of *Aberdeen*.

7. That I struck in with the Presbyterians out of pique, because I was not permitted to return to the Exercise of my Ministry in *Aberdeen*.

8. That I broke off all Correspondency, with those of the Episcopal party, even my most intimate Acquaintance.

9. That I vented my self, as bitterly, and severely against them, as any Presbyterian whatsoever.

10. That Pique, Interest and Popularity, were my Temptation.

11. That at first I pretended, I would only attempt to reclaim the deluded people of the *West*, from their Errours and Extravagancies, all which I confidently averr are gross Untruths and Lies.

I am not sensible that I have given these Men, any cause or occasion so to abuse me, nor can I see any great advantage to their cause thereby, and tho' there were Truth in these charges, where-with he endeavoureth to defame me, yet of all Men in the World, the Prelates and Prelatists in *Scotland*, should be most ashamed to upbraid me therewith: The most of their Bishops and Clergy having contrary to most solemn and sacred Oaths, received the abjured Prelacy, and renounced and abjured their former Oaths, and some of their Bishops having submitted to Re-ordination, to the great Scandal not only of this but other Reformed Churches, and contrary to the example of their Predecessors, in the days of King *James* the VIth. Yet I judge no Man for his Principle or Motives, but leave that to God and their own Consciences, tho' this Author Intruding in Gods Throne, is bold to judge of my Heart, and to say, *It was Pique, Interest and Popularity that moved me.*

The

The Falshood of his Assertions will appear by a true Narrative of the things to which he seemeth to relate, which I shall give with due Candor and Simplicity, not being afraid humbly to Appeal not only to the Judgment of all Men who know the things ; but to the All-seeing God of Truth, to judge betwixt Him and Me in this Matter.

I was Ordained Minister of the Gospel in the Honourable City of *Aberdeen*, Anno 1659. by the laying one of the Hands of the Presbytery. And when Prelacy was reintroduced in this Land, Anno 1662. I was stopt in the Exercise of my Ministry, before the first of *October* by that same Act of Council, which laid aside divers Hundreds of worthy Ministers of this Church, and obliged us to retire twenty Miles distant from our own Parishes, because we had not received Presentation from the Patron and Collation from the Bishop, The condition of which, was the Oath of Canonical Obedience.

It's false which this Author saith (and may be reckoned as the twelfth of his Lies) that Mr. *Meinzius* and I did only hesitate at first, upon the Oath of Canonical Obedience, for we never had any hesitation, or doubt upon it, but were clear and positive in our Judgment against it, and exprest it as we had occasion. It's true we did at the first offer Submission, and to join in Presbyteries and Synods, thinking this was but the same, which worthy men had done before the year 1638. Not discerning, as others who suffered did, the difference betwixt the State of things, Anno 1662. And before the year, 1638.

Tho this stop in the exercise of my Ministry, was fourteen days before the Bishops Synod, yet at that Synod when he did pass Sentence of Deposition, against Learned and Pious Mr. *Meinzius*, for not Subscribing the Oath of Canonical Obedience; tho he offered Submission: The Bishop was pleased to join me in the Sentence, tho neither present nor cited to be present. Whether Bishop *Mitchel* did Vindicate this his Illegal and Unjust procedure by that lovely Proverb our Author mentioneth, *Fides sit penes Authorem*; But I was nothing moved with this Sentence.

Sometime after this, I retired to the Country twenty eight Miles beyond *Aberdeen*, yet in the beginning of *December*, there cometh to me a Summons before the secret Council, as was said by the procurement of the Bishop of *Aberdeen*, alledging he could not appear on the Streets of that City for fear of the People Irritated, as was alledged, by their Pastors whom they had lost. At that time
were

were cited, also the famous and worthy, old Mr. *Cant*, and his Son Mr. *Alexander*, and Mr. *Meinzies*. The good old man got a Testificat that he was not able to Travel. The rest of us went South with no less hazard than our Lives, it beign a grievous Storm and Tempest. Mr. *Alexander Cant* falling unwell compeared not. When Mr. *Meinzes* and I compeared, the Earl of *Midletoun* then Lord Commissioner, and the Earl of *Glencarn* Lord Chancellor, and others of the Council, finding that there was nothing to lay to our charge, and hearing from us, that we were willing to join in Presbyteries and Synods, did by Act of secret Council recommend us to the Bishop of St. *Andrews*, to be restored to our places.

When this was presented to the Bishop of St. *Andrews*, he readily promised to obey it, but never spoke to us one word of the Oath of Canonical Obedience. Yea I would ask any judicious Person, if it was probable that (knowing our peremptory declared Resolutions against it) either the Bishop of St. *Andrews* would have insisted to require, or we consented to Subscribe that Oath, when we had an Act of Council in our Favours, and at the same time they had published a Treatise, entituled, a *Plea for Submission to the present Government*, wherein they made offer of diverse Concessions to them who would submit. But the Bishop of St. *Andrews*, being then ready to go from *Edinburgh* to St. *Andrews*, desired us in our return for *Aberdeen*, to call for his Letter, which he promised should be ready for us. But neither when we came to St. *Andrews*, did he speak to us of Subscribing the Oath of Canonical Obedience, nor did we subscribe any Paper to him, nor stay with him one quarter of an hour, it being late, and he studying his Christmas Sermon, and we to go over the Ferry. Nor did his Letter to the Bishop of *Aberdeen* bear any thing of our Subscribing that Oath, neither would I have been the bearer of so manifest an untruth. Yea when in his Letter he had written, that we were willing to own the Government. I refused to receive it, unless he added this Qualification (*so far as to join in Presbyteries and Synods*) to which he agreed, when we would take it on no other terms.

Neither did Bishop *Mitchel* after our Return, insist any more on our Subscribing the Oath of Canonical Obedience; but having called together some Ministers, there was a paper drawn out of the words of the above-mentioned Letter, which Paper indeed we did Subscribe, and I hear some of that Party, whether out of Curiosity or ill will at me, have searched for it among Bishop *Mitchel's* Papers. But I value not what use they make of it. That Paper

the Bishop ordered Doctor *Keith* to read publickly in *Aberdeen*. Thinking thereby to lessen our esteem among the People, but that design failed, none of us were present at the reading of it. But the next Lords day when I appeared first to Preach, I told publickly (Mr. *J. P.* then Bishop of *Ross*, being present) that I conceived that I had yielded to nothing, but what I first offered.

But seeing this Author is not only injurious to me, but to learned and Pious Mr. *Meinzius*; whose memory is precious to me, beside all that I have said for his Honour, I add that not only the Test, but the Subscribing of this Paper, was grievous to that good man before his death, and although I was then at South, I had it afterward, from a worthy Person and Friend of his who had it from himself. And I can say of my self, I did lament because of it several years before that, and altho this Author design me no favour, yet as sometimes we are more obliged to our Enemies, than to our friends. so here he giveth me opportunity to tell the World, that I repent for the Subscribing of this Paper. Altho I never Subscribed the Oath of Canonical Obedience. But being then young and paying too much deference and respect to a friend who drew it; I did the less seriously consider either the Words or matter of it.

I confess I afterwards was in Friendship with Bishop *Scougal* who was a Learned and moderate Man, I did also sit in Presbyteries and Synods, thinking my self free to join in these Duties to which I was Authorized by my office, altho there had been no Bishop in the World, nor do I think that by this I payed formal Canonical Obedience, so that the asserting of this, may be reputed a thirteenth of this Authors lies. Yet if he or any else can shew me wherein I have complied contrary to my Principles, or to the just offence of others, which I have not confessed already, I am ready to acknowledge it was my fault, but this I can say, the Bishops themselves did not judge me a favourer of Prelacy, and my intimates knew me to be Presbyterian in my Principles, and I did never wittingly desert these Principles. For it's a manifest untruth which this Author asserts, that I swore and subscribed the Declaration when I was admitted Rector, in the *Mareschall* Colledge in *Aberdeen*. I neither took it then, nor at any other time, anent which I appeal to all records. Nor indeed was it required of me, nor did the Act mention Rectors.

It was not the least Cause of my refusing the Test, that I was obliged thereby to declare, that there lay no Obligation on me, to endeavour any Alteration in the Government of the Church. For I profess

profess I did judge it Duty in my Station, and according to my power, did endeavour to promote the Alteration, and the removal of Prelacy. And do not deny, I did Bless God, and Call the people of *Aberdeen* to Bless him for the removal of it, and pray that it may never return. But that ever I used Bitterness or Severity against any of that party, this Author cannot prove: And all who know me, do know these are things which I abhor, and my desire is to promote Meekness and Charity among Men:

These also, who were of the Prelatical way, and Intimately acquainted with me, know the Falshood of what he says of my breaking off all Correspondence with them in any thing which Civility and Friendship obligerh me unto. Yea, I am confident not only they, but all of that way, who know me, will allow me this Testimony that whenever they desired, yea, on all occasions according to my power, I was ready to do them Acts of Kindness. And when I was last in *Aberdeen*, the present Incumbents of that place and I did Friendly Visit one another. It's true one of them being occasionally in a Neighbours House, came to me as I lighted from my Horse, and desired me to preach for him the next Lords day (but neither he nor any else did it afterwards:) And I hope he will not say, but I gave him a Civil, and as I conceive an Answer which might have satisfied him.

As for what this Author saith, That it was *Pique* which moved Me to strike in with the Presbyterians, because I was not permitted to return to the Exercise of my Ministry at *Aberdeen*. This is a presumptuous ascending Gods Throne, to judge my Heart, and Motives. As also what he saith afterward. That *Pique, Interest and Popularity*, were my Temptation: I can comfortably say, He that knoweth all Things, knoweth this is false. It was Conscience, and not such base Motives that moved Me: And I think I may obtain Testimony from these who know me both in the *North* and *West*, that they have other Thoughts of me than that I am led by such base Motives. It's true the Town of *Aberdeen*, to whose kindness I always was, and am on all occasions, much obliged, when they conceived any hopes of obtaining my regrefs to them without any Obligation or Oath, did move for it. But neither this Author, nor any else can prove that I did desire it, or made any Application to the Bishops for it. How far some of the Bishops complied with a great person of the *Romish* persuasion, to obstruct that design (tho it was known that it

it was difference of Religion that engaged him against it) the Town of *Aberdeen* know in part, and I leave it to the Bishops own Consciences to judge. For I ingenuously profess I never had any Pique at them on that account, nor was it Pique, but Conscience, which moved me; to joyn with the Presbyterians, for I being such in my judgment, and about a year after the time, he speaks of, by an unexpected Providence, receiving an Unanimous Call, from a Noble Person (who also was Patron of the Parish) and other Heretors and Body of the people of the Parish of *Kilwinning*, an united Parish, which for divers years had been vacant; I did by the Approbation of the Presbytery of *Irwin*, come and Labour among them in the Work of the Gospel. Yet there is more than one falshood insinuated by this Author, in that which he saith in the beginning of this Paragraph, concerning Me, that ever since King *James's* Indulgence I did Preach in a Meeting-house, for it was a year after that Liberty was given, that I entered here, and for these two years without the Reluctancy of any, have Preached in the Church. It is true in the year 1688. the Congregation Assembled in another House than the Church, the Law not allowing us the same, tho' all that time it was empty, except that Mr. *Bell*, being after my coming here presented by the Bishop, came and Preached to his own Servant, and two or three more (who were solicited to hear him) at two several times in the Forenoon, and went off in the Afternoon; and having for that obtained half a years Stipend, was presented to another Church, where he had little better Reception.

It is also false which he saith, in the end of this Paragraph, that at first, I pretended that I would only attempt to reclaim the deluded people of the West, from their Errours and Extravagancies. Perhaps he designeth by this, to breed in the people a dislike of me. But I hope they will not believe him. And it is most false that ever I exprest my self so concerning the people of the West, or my design in going among them. My design was to Preach the Gospel of Christ, and to advance Truth and Holiness, and Peace and Love among Men. I acknowledge, if a Minister find any Errours, or Extravagancies among a people, his endeavour should be to reclaim them, but I bless God this Author cannot justly charge this Congregation with these things.

As for what he saith, was foretold by a Person of Quality, and great Worth; I neither know of whom he meaneth, nor yet the prediction, and perhaps this is of the same kind, with the rest of

our Authors Assertions. Sure I am diverse Persons of Quality and Worth, to whom I did shew my Call, did approve my Acceptance of it, tho' in their Affection, they regrated my going from the North.

In fine, tho' this Author hath said that it could not be denied that I carried my self well, and gained the good Opinion of all, while I kept my place at *Aberdeen*; and instanceth me as a judicious Person, tho' under Temptation: Yet he is so discreet in the end, as to represent both this people and me as ensnared in extravagant Fooleries; but I forgive him. It is a small thing for me to be judged of Men; better than I have been rated as Fools. But in love to his Soul I commend to his Meditation, *Mat. 5. 22.* and *Rev. 22. 15.*

I am really weary in insisting so long on things relating to my Person. I do acknowledge the World would be at no great loss tho' I were buried in the Dust, and my Name in Oblivion, and were it not for my respect to the publick Interest, which this Author endeavoureth to hurt by exposing me, I should not have troubled my self, and the Reader with this Vindication, being hopeful that his defaming of me cannot hinder my acceptance, nor the success of my Labours, where I am known.

I hear, there are some other things, in that Pamphlet, which relate to me, but my Friend gave me no transcript of them, nor have I seen the Book, and I am told they are of no great Moment, and but By-blows to me, while he is reflecting on other Persons and Things, and perhaps you may sufficiently Vindicate them without my help.

I am told he acknowledgeth I preached a Sermon for Moderation, but added such Cautions as made all ineffectual. To which I shall only say, I know none that deny, but there is need of Caution, lest Men under the Name of Moderation degenerate to Lukewarmness, and excluding of Zeal; but I know no Caution I gave which had not a Scripture warrant. And if this Author had heard it, I think he hath good will enough to represent it, could he catch at any shadow of ground for it.

I am also told, he reflects on me about a Paper said to be given in to the *General Assembly*, wherein it should have been said the Gospel had not been preached in *Aberdeen* these 30 years, but not having seen the Book, nor any Transcript of that matter I can give no distinct Answer. But as it's related to me, it seemeth of a Piece with the rest of his Assertions; only to satisfie any sober person, who may be stumbled at such an Expression, I do publicly profess, I am lo
far

far from thinking so, or approving any who should think or speak it, that I Assert and Declare, I have in that time often heard, to my great Comfort and Edification, the Gospel both plainly and powerfully preached at *Aberdeen*.

But I fear I have wearied you, and shall only add that I shall not cease to pray the Lord would preserve you long to do him service in his Church, and shall continue,

Your Brother,

Kilwinning,
September
28. 1691.

and Servant,

in the Lord,

G. M.

F I N I S.
